

LIBRARY
UNIVERSITY OF
CALIFORNIA
SAN DIEGO

ASPECTS OF ANGLICANISM



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2007 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

ASPECTS OF
ANGLICANISM

OR

SOME COMMENTS ON CERTAIN EVENTS
IN THE 'NINETIES

BY

MGR. MOYES, D.D.

CANON OF WESTMINSTER CATHEDRAL

LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO.

39 PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON

NEW YORK AND BOMBAY

1906

NIHIL OBSTAT.

GULIELMUS CANONICUS GILDEA, S.T.D.,
Censor Deputatus.

IMPRIMATUR.

GULIELMUS PRAEPOSITUS JOHNSON,
Vicarius Generalis.

WESTMONASTERII,
die 12 Januarii, 1906.

P R E F A C E

THE chapters of this book appeared substantially in a series of articles in *The Tablet*, at various dates between 1890 and 1899. By the courtesy of the Editor, I am allowed to republish them in book form. The motive which prompted their composition, and now induces me to republish them, was simply the conviction that certain principles of faith are more easily set forth in the light of concrete illustrations than by abstract statements, and that such concrete illustrations are most conveniently sought in the facts and incidents of the religious world of our time. That must stand as an apology for turning the attention of the reader back to some of the happenings of the last decade, which, however belated as facts, may still do duty as object-lessons of the principles involved.

J. MOYES.

18th January, 1906.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
PREFACE - - - - -	v
I. THE LAMBETH JUDGMENT AND ANGLICAN OBEDIENCE - -	1
II. THE EVE OF THE LAMBETH JUDGMENT - - - - -	3
III. THE VATICAN COUNCIL—THE IMMACULATE CONCEPTION -	8
IV. WHY NOT AN ANGLICAN PATRIARCHATE? - - - - -	13
V. A THREEFOLD RIFT—MONASTICISM, RITUAL AND ORDERS -	17
VI. THE "RECONCILIATION" OF ST. PAUL'S CATHEDRAL - -	23
VII. ALTAR AGAINST ALTAR - - - - -	27
VIII. CONTINUITY—LETTERS OLD AND NEW - - - - -	31
IX. THE RECEPTION OF THE LAMBETH JUDGMENT - - - -	33
X. THE LESSON OF THE LAMBETH JUDGMENT - - - - -	37
XI. DIVISIONS AND ECCENTRICITIES - - - - -	45
XII. DOUBLE-DEALING IN WORSHIP - - - - -	49
XIII. ARCHBISHOP BENSON ON THE "ITALIAN MISSION" - -	56
XIV. ARE WE AN "ITALIAN MISSION"? - - - - -	59
XV. WITH WHOM IS "THE ANCIENT CHURCH OF ENGLAND"? -	61
XVI. A POPULAR STATEMENT OF ANGLICAN CONTINUITY - -	78
XVII. A DIOCESE AS AN OBJECT-LESSON IN CONTINUITY - -	88
XVIII. THE CATHOLIC CONSTITUTION OF THE CHURCH AND THE ROYAL SUPREMACY - - - - -	98
XIX. AN ANGLICAN EPISCOPAL ELECTION - - - - -	107
XX. ANGLICANISM AND MONASTICISM AND PENITENTIAL WORKS -	117
XXI. ANGLICANISM IN AMERICA—HOW THE REFORMATION IS BEING FOUND OUT - - - - -	123
XXII. AN ANGLICAN ENTHRONEMENT—CONTINUITY BY CONTRASTS -	135
XXIII. PASSION SERVICES IN ENGLAND—WHO WINS? - - - -	142
XXIV. AN ANGLICAN MONUMENT - - - - -	149
XXV. ANGLICANISM IN IRELAND—"THE CHURCH OF ST. PATRICK"	156
XXVI. LAY REPRESENTATION OR LAY DICTATION IN THE CHURCH— AN IRISH SYNOD - - - - -	163

CHAPTER	PAGE
XXVII. ANGLICANISM AND THE ERASTIAN PRINCIPLE - - -	171
XXVIII. A PAPAL ENCYCLICAL - - - - -	178
XXIX. ANGLICANISM AND THE EASTERNS - - - - -	182
XXX. EASTERN CHRISTIANITY - - - - -	192
XXXI. AN INVITATION TO TAKE PART IN ANGLICAN WORSHIP - -	206
XXXII. RELICS AND RELIO-VENERATION - - - - -	225
XXXIII. ANGLICAN APPROPRIATION—WHY NOT APPROPRIATE THE POPE? - - - - -	233
XXXIV. AN ANGLICAN CHURCH CONGRESS—WHO IS THE ALIEN? -	241
XXXV. A SAMPLE OF LOW CHURCH OPINION - - - - -	247
XXXVI. ENGLISH CHURCH HISTORY AT AN ENGLISH CHURCH CONGRESS	255
XXXVII. ANGLICANISM AND THE DOCTRINE OF PURGATORY - - -	260
XXXVIII. DR. PLUNKET AND HIS ORDINATION OF CABRERA - - -	271
XXXIX. THE MITRE AT BRISTOL - - - - -	281
XL. ANGLICANISM AND DIVORCE - - - - -	284
XLI. A PICTURE OF LOW CHURCH ANGLICANISM—WHAT THEY THINK OF US - - - - -	292
XLII. ANTICHRIST IN ENGLISH CHURCH HISTORY - - - - -	295
XLIII. A DEDICATION SERVICE AT PETERBOROUGH - - - - -	301
XLIV. THE LAMBETH JUDGMENT AND THE PRIVY COUNCIL - - -	310
XLV. THE LAMBETH JUDGMENT AS AN EIRENICON - - - - -	317
XLVI. ROME AND THE STATUTE OF PROVVISORS - - - - -	326
XLVII. ANGLICANISM AND THE APPEAL TO SCRIPTURE - - - - -	343
XLVIII. ANGLICAN THEORY—ST. PETER AND THE APOSTLES AND THE BISHOPS - - - - -	361
XLIX. WINCHESTER AS AN OBJECT-LESSON OF CONTINUITY - - -	373
L. WINCHESTER, A LANTERN LECTURE - - - - -	384
LI. THE WINCHESTER PRIORS - - - - -	390
LII. A WINCHESTER BISHOP—WILLIAM OF WYKEHAM - - - -	393
LIII. A WINCHESTER SCHOOL CHAPEL - - - - -	398
LIV. WINCHESTER WORSHIP - - - - -	404
LV. WINCHESTER SCHOOL - - - - -	412
LVI. VOTIVE CANDLE-BURNING - - - - -	422
LVII. A CHURCH CONGRESS AND AN APPEAL TO SCRIPTURE - -	429
LVIII. ANGLICANISM AND THE NESTORIANS - - - - -	443
LIX. AN ANGLICAN CONCEPTION OF CHURCH UNITY - - - - -	458
LX. ARCHBISHOP BENSON ON ST. GERMAN OF AUXERRE - - - -	469
LXI. THE CHARACTERISTICS OF THE GOD-MADE CHURCH AND OF THE MAN-MADE CHURCH - - - - -	474
LXII. CHARACTERISTICS OF THE ANGLICAN CRISIS - - - - -	481
INDEX - - - - -	493

CHAPTER I.

The Lambeth Judgment and Anglican Obedience.

(JULY, 1890.)

WE are in July, 1890. How will the Lambeth Judgment be received? Anglicanism casts the Scripture into the bosom of the Primitive Church and the Fathers, only that it may use its private judgment and its own sweet will in interpreting all three. Anglicanism rejoices in the wild liberty which comes of having no restraint save the Bible and patristic tomes on the shelf and its Church formularies—the dead rule, which cannot control when it is being set at naught, nor cry out while it is being misinterpreted. Will this wilful and wayward child of misrule lay aside her way of self-interpreting the things that are silent, and listen and obey when for once she has to deal with a living voice, and when it is the head of her own household who speaks to her?

Were we to judge by *The Church Times*, the discipline of obedience which comes of dealing with a living voice is but little to the temper and taste of Anglicans. Five months ago it warned the Archbishop that he must not expect from them compliance with his judgment.

Under the rather uneasy title, "Are we Lawless?" it made the following manifesto. (The first sentence is so much truer than even the writer can have intended.)

Where there is no true authority there can be no true obedience. To submit to the Archbishop putting himself in a false position, and claiming that arbitrary authority which no one but God has a right to claim, is really disrespect and disobedience to the Arch-

bishop in that position in which God has placed him as *primus inter pares*, the President and representative of the Bishops of his Province. *The Rock* is quite correct in its supposition that one of our chief objections to Rome is that Rome claims that absolute obedience which God reserves as due to Himself alone, and we object to Popery at Lambeth as strongly as at Rome (4th July, 1890).

Last week, writing upon the eve of the Lambeth Judgment, the same journal adopts, in perhaps more moderate terms, the same unbending attitude:—

The Archbishop of Canterbury to-day at Lambeth delivers the long-expected judgment in the case of the Bishop of Lincoln. It is idle to attempt to disguise the fact that the decisions on the points involved have been looked for with intense anxiety, particularly by those who long for some expression of authority on points of ritual, and the doctrine which is involved in them. . . . The opportunity for such an authoritative interpretation of the laws of the Church of England has not yet been reached. The Archbishop's claim to be a *judex solus* to try his suffragans has not passed without protest, and though the judgment to be delivered to-day will be, no doubt, accepted as a learned contribution to the great ritual contest—for this it cannot fail to be—it nevertheless remains that the Court sitting at Lambeth does not commend itself to the judgment of able canonists as being competent in the present case. The decision, of course, affects the Bishop of Lincoln alone, and he alone will decide what his ultimate course will be, but that we have reached the final stage in the great controversy we do not believe, and, therefore, prayerful patience is still demanded of those who have faith in the ultimate vindication of the Catholicity of the Church of England.

Apropos of which *The Record* says:—

We notice with regret that some of our contemporaries have broached the extraordinary doctrine that the Archbishop's Judgment affects the Bishop of Lincoln alone, and is of no general application. We earnestly trust that for the credit of the English clergy no more will be heard of a notion which has neither sense nor morality to recommend it. . . . There is something ludicrous in the idea that there are, if there are, clergymen in England who can persuade themselves to disobey the law with an easy conscience because they have not been personally ordered to obey it.

How far the Archbishop might turn from disobedient High Churchmen to seek obedience in the Low Church, or the opponents of the Bishop of Lincoln, can be gathered from

the fact that they are at this very moment considering the advisability of an appeal from his judgment. The tribunal of the Primate of all England is, after all, but a Court of Second Instance. The appeal evidently lies higher up. There is a curious law in the nature of Power by which it travels in a circle and ends where it begins. The point from which it set out by way of institution is the source to which it finds its way back by way of appeal. That apparently the Church of England should seek—by the declaration of its own members—its last point of appeal in that chamber of the Privy Council where Thomas Cromwell first drafted the statute of the Royal Supremacy, teaches a lesson to those who are fond of the study of origins.

CHAPTER II.

The Eve of the Lambeth Judgment.

(16TH AUGUST, 1890.)

ONE of the most remarkable signs of the times is the attitude of the Anglican body to the impending Lambeth Judgment. The judgment itself is not expected to be given before the first week in December. But word has gone forth that it will be adverse, at least in its main bearing, to the friends and followers of the Bishop of Lincoln.

It is but natural that those who are chiefly affected by the coming decision should foregather and take counsel together as to the manner and spirit in which they are going to receive it. It is not just yet a question of obeying or resisting. Time enough for either when the judgment shall have been formally delivered. But the interval has been found to be useful in formulating a policy, in closing up the ranks, and in choosing the ground for future action.

As to what that future policy and ground will be, the speech and action of Anglican leaders during the last week leave no possibility for doubt. First, we note that an effort is made to discount the importance of the coming

decision. Secondly, a determination is shown to discredit the judgment beforehand by denying its validity, and by limiting its practical effect to the case of the person indicted. The whole policy might be summed up as one of "Don't care," combined with what is known in France as the attitude of *Quand même*.

The following is a fair sample of the "Don't care," or the natural desire to hush down and pooh-pooh the importance of the Archbishop's decision. The Rev. T. O. Marshall, the Organising Secretary of the English Church Union, writes as follows in *The Church Review* :—

I have not met with any one of any school of thought in the Church who is particularly anxious for the judgment to be delivered. Why should we be anxious? We all know now, and have known for the last twenty years, all that can be said about the seven points at issue. I was told the other day that of all men really anxious in London as to the judgment, it was Cardinal Manning. . . . We are all too busy and too well assured as to our position to trouble our heads as to what the judgment is likely to be, or when it will be delivered.

But is it so? *Pace* Mr. Marshall, it seems that no less than 136 incumbents of London, members, for the most part, of his own society, were not too busy to assemble last week and hold a meeting expressly to consider the very matter referred to. Their deliberations were long, earnest and exhaustive. They drew up a number of propositions of the highest practical importance. Moreover, *The Church Times* assures us that these propositions, far from being lightly considered, "had been disseminated throughout the country for a fortnight," and "were re-published with the names of their introducers". The importance of the meeting and of its work was further marked by a "general expression amongst the clergy that it was advisable that a full and accurate digest of the speeches should be prepared and circulated".

These facts do not at all fit in with Mr. Marshall's description of the Anglican body as being too busy to trouble their heads about the judgment. At all events they show that a public profession of nonchalance or indifference is not meant

for a moment to preclude a policy of earnest speech and energetic action.

The meeting just mentioned embodied this policy in certain propositions. These lose nothing of their force if read in the light of the speeches which accompanied them. We have the authority of *The Church Times* for saying that (save only one portion of the last) they "were approved *nemine contradicente*". It seems therefore only reasonable to accept these propositions as the authentic and unanimous manifesto of this section of Anglicanism, and the forecast of its future action. They voice what I have endeavoured to express as the *Quand même*.

The first declares flatly that the Archbishop has no spiritual jurisdiction to try the Bishop of Lincoln, and that the "Synod of the Province" is the only competent tribunal for the purpose. It will be remembered that the one point which the Archbishop has decided is that he *has* jurisdiction and that his Court *is* the proper tribunal. The 136 incumbents, however, review and reverse this, his first decision. One is inclined to ask—If it be thus in the green wood, what will it be in the dry?

This first resolution suggests a very far-reaching inquiry. Where is the living authority or Court which can decide what is or is not within the Archbishop's jurisdiction? I say "*living* authority," for dead authorities, such as canons and decrees of early councils, obviously require authoritative application and interpretation, so that the question only repeats itself until we find a Court or actual authority to apply, interpret, and enforce them.

The second proposition states that the Archbishop, by admitting the spiritual authority of the Privy Council, has deprived his judgment of all spiritual validity.

Taken seriously, such a resolution has an ominous significance. It logically means that Anglicanism will regard as null and worthless all future judgments from Lambeth, until an Archbishop can be found who will claim spiritual juris-

diction, distinct from and independent of the authority of the Crown, as exercised through the Privy Council. That practically amounts to a self-granted dispensation from ecclesiastical obedience, and one of which the term extends liberally far into the remote future. It may be fairly doubted if its authors intended it to mean so much, or to carry so far.

The third declares that some of the points raised ("altar lights" and "mixed chalice") are matters of "Œcumenical Authority," and as such are above the interference of even a Provincial Synod, much more of an Archbishop's Court. This resolution lifts the whole question of Anglican practice up to a totally new plane, and places it far beyond the reach of any hostile legislation, whether from Lambeth or St. Stephen's. It means that on these points—and presumably on the whole six or seven—there exists in England no authority competent to forbid or to restrain their usage. Even the ideal Archbishop of the future, who is to defy the Privy Council, would himself be powerless to deal with them. Here one cannot help congratulating the 136 incumbents upon having entrenched themselves upon immeasurably higher and nobler ground than mere interpretations of successive editions of the Prayer-book, which seemed to assume that Cranmer, Parker, and their collaborators, were endued with some mystic gift of rubrical finality. We welcome the fact that Anglicanism for the future makes frankly its appeal to authority outside of England, namely, to Œcumenical Authority. That such an Œcumenical Authority is not a dead or lapsed, or in abeyance, but must of its nature be a living, speaking, judging, authority, is a further truth to which sincere and logical minds may be trusted to find their way in due season.

The last proposition states that any condemnation of the Bishop of Lincoln would affect himself alone, and would have no binding effect upon the belief or action of others.

It is not easy to see why, if the third proposition be true, even the Bishop of Lincoln should be held subject to a decision from which every one else is to be free. Then it seems to imply that the Archbishop has power over religious

persons, but not over religious practices. Moreover, it would reduce the Archbishop to the tedious necessity of blowing out only one set of altar lights at a time, and even that only after a troublesome process of litigation. In fact one correspondent of *The Church Review* gleefully suggests that "should the Bishop of Lincoln be forced into giving up the use of lights personally, a hundred churches should at once adopt them, new centres of Ritualistic influence". Apparently there are lights which kindle the lights and of a kind which the Archbishop cannot extinguish.

It will be thus seen that the attitude which Higher Anglicanism has taken up in view of the authority of Dr. Benson lacks neither boldness nor clearness. The Archbishop has given one judgment—that upon his own jurisdiction—and he is going to give another. The section of the Anglican body on which, in the person of Dr. King, he is sitting in judgment, proceeds without waiting further to turn the tables, and in an informal court of 136 incumbents, practically sits in judgment upon him. His first decision is rejected without ceremony. His second, which is not yet even delivered, is prospectively nullified and torn in shreds by four separate resolutions. That this defiance of the Lambeth Judgment was the very object of the assembly, and that the forestalling of the decision by a previous refusal to submit was part of a policy advisedly adopted is calmly admitted by *The Church Times*.

The *raison d'être* of the meeting was that a protest against the Court itself should be prepared for general acceptance, before the judgment had been pronounced, in order to show that it was un-influenced by its findings; and also to show what was *ultra vires* of even a Provincial Synod to forbid.

In the meantime the proceedings have not passed without some very outspoken comments from another section of the Church of England. *The Record*, which claims to voice the Protestant masses of the country, sums up the position as follows:—

No Court is good enough for the law-breaking clergy, and, on the other hand, every Court has hitherto condemned them. It is

impossible not to connect these two facts. Giving the very fullest scope for the exercise of self-conceit, it is difficult to believe that the extremists still retain much confidence in the legality of their innovations. They have reached a further stage. They virtually admit their disloyalty to the Reformation. They claim freedom to do and to say whatever they are pleased to think would have been done and said by the "Catholic Church" at some undefined epoch and without attention to the existing laws in either Church or State. That is the present position of the extreme High Church party. It is scarcely necessary to add that it is not only subversive of the union of Church and State, but it is also in sharp antagonism to the survival of the Church of England as a Christian body separate from and protesting against the Church of Rome.

Such are the conditions and such the mental atmosphere in which an Archbishop of Canterbury has been called to the unwonted task of delivering an authoritative judgment.

CHAPTER III.

The Vatican Council—The Immaculate Conception.

(30TH AUGUST, 1890.)

ONE reason why an Anglican critic considers that our conclusions are likely, as far as Anglicans are concerned, to fall short of conviction, is that "the Vatican Council is far too recent in 1870 for 'sincere and logical minds' not to remember how the dogma of the Infallibility was not argued but carried by force". Therein lies a contention which, to be true at all, implies a great deal. Rome with railways and telegraphs in the nineteenth century is not like Rimini in the fourth. Nor is it quite an easy task to "force" an Ecumenical Council of some 600 bishops.

However, to examine it. Let us look the fact fairly in the face. On 18th July, 1870, 533 bishops assembled at the Vatican, solemnly voted the dogma of Papal Infallibility. According to the hypothesis, they did not believe in it. Pius IX. forced them to act and speak as if they did. He compelled them to do violence to their conscience, to perjure themselves and deceive the whole Catholic world.

He made them one by one say *Placet* when they would have wished to say *non Placet*. More wonderful still! One would have imagined that when the bishops escaped from Rome and returned to their respective dioceses, then at last they would have been free. Not so. Acting still under the influence of their recent terror, they could not shake off the spell, and they addressed to their flocks eloquent pastorals asking them to accept the dogma as the revealed word of God. In fact, the entire Episcopate—more than a thousand bishops—in one way or other thus expressed to Rome their hearty adhesion to the Decree. The forcing of the Council *in urbe* was after all but child's play compared to this achievement of forcing the entire Episcopate *in orbe*. Then, more wonderful still. The coercion employed for such a gigantic effect could hardly be a hidden one. At least, by those upon whom it was exercised, it must have been seen and felt. And yet, of the 533 bishops, all have either not perceived it or have kept the secret, if they did. In Rome or at home, the majority have not published any expression of protest or complaint. Some, like Cardinal Manning, and men of like calibre of truthfulness in other nations, have even gone out of their way to bear public witness that the Council was absolutely free. Such is the fact of the Forced Council. It is a case of ecclesiastical hypnotism upon a world-wide scale. I have no wish to burlesque it, but rather to state it in its plainest and simplest bearings. It might mean more than I have described, but from its very terms it could not mean less. I cannot doubt that the writer in *The Church Times* believes it. He would not assert it if he did not. But when he asks others to believe it too, his request will not be found to be an easy one. Many men will feel that this stupendous force-fact is immeasurably harder to accept than Papal Infallibility.

The same article finds a further objection "in the Papal Bull of 1854, when the Blessed Virgin's own birth was interpreted in the teeth of pronouncements of the Saints and Doctors of the Church to be like to that of her Divine Son, free from all taint of original sin". The above is intended to convey with general accuracy the import of

the definition upon the Immaculate Conception. It would be unfair to treat it as if it were meant for a precise or scientific statement of the doctrine. The terms used, however, are at least suggestive of some measure of misconception of its meaning.

The exemption of the Blessed Virgin from original sin is in one sense truly enough "like that of her Divine Son". Exemption is a negative term, and, as such, one exemption must always be very much like another. But in another and positive sense, the two exemptions could hardly be more unlike. It often seems as if a large share of the difficulty which non-Catholics feel in dealing with this doctrine arose from a tendency to approach it by the negative rather than by its positive side.

After all, the exempting or the rescuing of a soul from the sin that overshadows human birth is a very real and positive work. It can only be effected by the Holy Spirit entering the soul and excluding the sin by His sanctifying grace. When He does so in the case of souls already some time in being, His indwelling purifies them from original sin already contracted. We call that baptism. When He enters the soul in the first instant of its being, His indwelling thereby precludes it from contracting original sin at all. We call that the Immaculate Conception. Both are His work, and one and the same work. The difference between them is radically one of time—the difference between the first and a subsequent moment of a soul's existence. The difference is that which lies between a work of prevention and one of cure. (Therein also the root of other differences as to the proneness to evil.) The simple is found in the sublime.

But whence is it that the Holy Spirit should do this work in the soul of the Blessed Virgin? From precisely the same cause that He comes into our souls in baptism—the merits of Christ's saving Blood applied to her and to our souls. Thus looked at from its real and positive side, the unlikeness between Christ's exemption and the Blessed Virgin's exemp-

tion stands out in relief. Christ is exempt by right of His Godhead. Sin could have no part in Him. Mary, on the contrary, is exempt only through Christ. Her exemption is His work, insomuch that it is by His merits that the Holy Spirit was sent to operate in her the wonders of His grace in the initial moment of her existence (which we call Conception), and that sin was thus precluded from her soul. The two exemptions are not like in the sense of co-ordinates. Hers is subordinate to His, as an effect to its cause. His right is the free and gracious cause of her privilege, just as His atonement is the source of her holiness.

There is one sense in which the doctrine ought to commend itself to Anglicans. They emphasise, and rightly so, the value and completeness of Christ's atonement. To believe that the Blessed Virgin was by Christ's merits and death saved from original sin, under the shadow of which, in the ordinary course of things, she would have fallen, is to believe that she owes more to the saving Blood of her Son than if, like others, she had merely been purified from the stain of sin already contracted. Her debt to the Redeemer is deeper and her redemption fuller than even that of the least worthy of mankind. She is of all human beings the one who owes most to the saving merits of Christ's precious Blood—the one who more than all others "rejoices in God her Saviour". Hence to us the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception glorifies and enhances the doctrine of the Atonement.

Then, as to the Bull of 1854. The writer may not be aware that the Bull *Ineffabilis* was not issued until Pius IX. had long and carefully consulted the Church at large and elicited the opinion of all the bishops and all the seats of theological learning in Catholic Christendom. The Pope did nothing more than define what he found by universal and irrefragable testimony, to be taught and believed by the whole Church throughout the Catholic world. The Bishops of the Church assembled, as at Nicæa, Trent or the Vatican, are the Church *in Council*. The bishops teaching in their sees throughout the world are the Church

diffused. But the Church, whether in Council or diffused—*collecta vel dispersa*—is infallible in her teaching. The definition of Papal Infallibility was the utterance of the Church in Council. The definition of the Immaculate Conception was the utterance of the Church diffused.

If I mistake not this principle—the authority of utterances of the Church diffused as co-ordinate with those of the Church in Council—finds recognition from leading Anglican writers. Thus, Mr. Gore, in his *Roman Catholic Claims*, says:—

A General Council is not a necessity. It was impossible for one set of causes for the first 300 years, but all through that period men like Irenæus and Tertullian were not prevented from arriving at the mind of the Church by the comparison of traditions. “The judgment of the Church *diffusive*,” says Mr. Wilberforce, “is no less binding than that of the Church *collective*” (p. 52).

Then the writer assures us that “Anglicans have no intention to fall in the Scylla of Popery, but they do mean to steer boldly through the Charybdis of Protestant intolerance”. No need to say that we wish heartily well to Anglicanism in its struggle against the drag-down influence of the Charybdis (which is, perhaps, a new name for the Church Association), and that we pray that it may land upon no worse Scylla than the Rock of which our Lord spoke when He promised that powers like those of the Charybdis “shall not prevail against it”. But the writer proceeds to say that Anglicanism “has, from the beginning, held the Six Œcumenical Councils of the Catholic Church as its heritage for ever; they are the foundation of its Canon Law, and what is laid down by those Councils forms part of its doctrine and discipline”.

From the beginning? But at the beginning, how beautifully the early English Church expressed it:—

“First of all admonishing that the pure and holy faith of the Council of Nice shall be by all who are enlisted in God’s service, firmly and faithfully held . . . so that they” (the priests) “shall in all things hold, profess, and preach the Apostolic faith approved of the Holy Ghost in the Six General Councils as it has been de-

livered to us by the Holy Roman Church, and, if need be, they shall not fear to lay down their lives for the same, and whomsoever the General Councils receive they shall receive, and whomsoever they condemn, they shall from their hearts reject and condemn" (Council of Chalcyth, A.D. 785, Wilkins, i., 146).

In those days English faith was evidently Roman as well as Catholic.

But if it be a revealed truth that the Pope is infallible, and that the Blessed Virgin is immaculate, why should it have taken eighteen centuries for the Church to find it out? For a reason which is very simple. The body of revealed truth—the Deposit of Faith, as we call it—was indeed given to the Church once and for all at the beginning. It closed with the last inspired writer. It is "the Faith once delivered to the Saints". But the Church's explicit knowledge of what is contained in this body of revealed truth is not instantaneous, but progressive. The Holy Spirit's gift of Revelation to the Church is over and done with, but His work of enlightening the mind of the Church to see more and more clearly its inner truths, and to draw forth the conclusions which it contains, is of a necessity gradual and evolutionary and spread over the ages. It required 325 years to call forth the definition of the consubstantiality of Christ at Nicæa, and every General Council since then marks a stage of fuller and clearer insight and expression.

CHAPTER IV.

Why not an Anglican Patriarchate?

(27TH SEPTEMBER, 1890.)

A CORRESPONDENT, who fears the signs of the times as preparing the way for a Canterbury Popedom, expresses in an Anglican journal¹ the following views on the prerogative of the Archbishop:—

For if Teutonic Christianity which, failing a German reformed Episcopate, is best expressed in the Anglo-Catholic Church throughout the world, is to hold its own against the consolidated Latin

¹ *The Church Times.*

Episcopate under the Pope, it must be consolidated itself also into one compact mass by frequent assemblies around one chair strong in associations and in influence presiding, not ruling, amongst co-equal brethren, each holding his voice and vote in freedom.

A bright feature in the future of Anglicanism would be the union of the entire Anglican body throughout the English-speaking world into one Patriarchate. Then the "Church Catholic," according to the Anglican conception of the name, would go forth, like one of those triple stars of which astronomers tell us, on its mission of light revolving around its threefold centre—Rome, Moscow and Canterbury. Three obstacles stand in the way.

The first is the temper of Anglicanism itself. The idea of jurisdiction or control enters into the very meaning of a Patriarchate—that is to say, if we are to take the institution in its Catholic and historic sense, and any other sense would in the present instance be hardly worth considering. "That he may have power" were the words in which the Council of Nicæa (Canon 6) first makes mention of a Patriarch. That this Nicæan "power" means power of confirmation, visitation and appeal is the practical interpretation given to the words by subsequent history. Hence to realise the idea of a Patriarchate it would not be enough for Anglican prelates "all over the world" to accept Canterbury as the capital of Anglicanism, to regard it as their common centre and meeting ground, or to invest its Archbishop with a right to precede and to preside after the Pan-Anglican precedent at their assemblies. That would be a presidency—an utterly un-Catholic ideal—but not a Patriarchate. The presidency is the shadow. The Patriarchate is the substance. To create and to preserve visible and organic unity is a visible and organic work, and work proceeds from substance and not from shadow. But the substance cannot be had without its price. It would mean that Anglican prelates outside England would now, and in the future, allow the Archbishop of Canterbury to confirm their elections, visit their dioceses, and decide their appeals. Is it likely?

The second obstacle lies in the system of Anglicanism. Its theory of the jurisdictional equality of bishops and the independence of sees is, strictly speaking, fatal to the very idea of a Patriarchate, except, of course, as a matter of mutual arrangement. The "tree system" by which one local church is supposed to go forth from another, take root for itself, and grow up independent of its parent-tree, reduces all unities greater than the diocese to the rank of a shadowy abstraction. A grove of trees is not an organisation, nor has it organic unity. The same reason—the equality of bishops—which is invoked to justify the separation of the Anglican Church from the Patriarchate of the West, will justify any Colonial Church in withdrawing its allegiance from the See of Canterbury. There is thus in the very household life of Anglicanism a law which prevents it from keeping its children under its own control. Such a law works adversely to the organic unity of the proposed Patriarchate. Neither are Colonial Churches, with their self-seeking temperament, slow to see the point or to act upon it.¹

A third obstacle is the liability of Anglican Churches, when disestablished, to fall a prey to ecclesiastical democracy. When such churches, by virtue of the centrifugal law at work in Ireland, Canada, British Columbia, achieve their autonomy, there at once of necessity arises the question of

¹ Compare the following from *The Church Times*: "It will be remembered that, in accordance with a resolution passed in the Canadian Provincial Synod, in the year 1886, a committee was appointed to consider the advisability of consolidating the Canadian Church, at present divided into various fragments, with no central authority to give cohesion. The committee reported in favour of a scheme of unification at the next session, in 1889, and hence, on the 15th of August last, a Conference of Bishops was held at Winnipeg, and the consolidation of the various dioceses and provinces of British North America into a Canadian Church, with a Primate at its head, independent of Canterbury, will soon be an accomplished fact. According to the scheme drawn up at Winnipeg, Eastern Canada will, as it now is, remain a province, the North-West will constitute a second province, and British Columbia will possibly constitute a third, and the Primate will of course be elected out of the Metropolitans. The Canadian Church, therefore, has taken an important step. Following the example of the South African Church, it becomes a sister Church to that which owns the primacy of Canterbury, and stands on an equal footing with the independent Church in the United States."

a constitution, and therein the inevitable spectre of lay representation. They have hardly freed themselves from the thrall of the Royal Supremacy and the Privy Council when they find them under the heavier yoke of the Synod and King Layman. Disestablishment or "independence" means a Synod, and one in which the masses of the laity will have a say—an influential, if not a preponderating say—even in matters of liturgy and doctrine. But it is precisely these masses which are still what Anglicans call "Protestant," and often of a Protestantism of an unpleasantly pronounced and Puritanical kind. What chance would men like the Bishop of Lincoln have in any Synod in which such an element was adequately represented? What measure of toleration would be given to the Real Presence, the Confessional, the lights, vestments and incense, and the other accessories so rightly dear to the hearts of Higher Anglicans in any of these assemblies? Nor would it accord with the Anglican theory of the authority of Church teaching that John Brown should be called away for an hour from his farm or shop to decide in Synod what doctrine his clergyman was to teach back to him for a corresponding hour on the following Sunday. Here there is at work another principle, this time not of organic but of doctrinal disintegration, and Anglicans are not slow to foresee and appreciate the danger of it. I quote from *The Church Times* :—

Unhappily, the Winnipeg Conference, in discussing the question of Synodical Government, has been led away into the devious paths of lay representation, whither the sister Church of the States has already wandered, and with disastrous results. The Canadian Bishops devise a scheme including the admission of laymen into the General Synod, whose province is to make laws concerning not only discipline, but also doctrine and worship. Unwarned by the difficulties of the Irish Church, that of Canada saddles itself with a burden which will probably do more to hinder real progress than any amount of opposition from outside, and in refusing to recognise its function as an *ecclesia docens*, will narrow the field where it can create an *ecclesia discens*.

Ah, yes! But is it such an easy problem to maintain a Church Teaching and a Church Taught (which holds its tongue and pays) upon a Reformation basis?—and are Canadian Bishops, who have lambs like the Toronto Orange-

men in their flocks, so very much to be blamed if they feel that such a solution is wildly impracticable and if they quietly bow to the inevitable. Some day the problem may present itself nearer home, and one can only hope that before then Anglicanism will have sufficiently permeated and educated the masses to convince them that lay representation in a doctrinal Synod inverts the very idea of a Church and means the sheep leading and pasturing the shepherds. When Anglicanism has taught the nation the meaning and force of a Church Teaching in relation to a Church Taught, and the English people have learned the lesson (and unlearned the lesson of the English Reformation), the problem of lay representation will have solved itself, and we shall be many steps nearer to the great goal of the one Fold and the one Shepherd.

CHAPTER V.

A Threefold Rift—Monasticism, Ritual and Orders.

(11TH OCTOBER, 1890.)

A CHURCH Congress is said to be an annual photograph of the Church of England. One can readily conceive that the picture, as presented by the meeting at Hull in 1890, is far from being either a perfect or complete one. But the main features of the landscape are there. The low-lying flats of Evangelicalism occupy only too much of the foreground. Beyond them are the heights of Anglicanism. Perhaps never before was more plainly portrayed the ever-widening breach which yawns between. Three papers brought out, with lurid effect, the depth of the cleavage.

The first dealt with the question of Brotherhoods. The scheme for the establishment of religious orders, working on the lines of poverty, celibacy and obedience, found an able advocate in Archdeacon Farrar. He was, if anything, over-anxious to impress upon his audience that the proposed Brotherhoods would be something widely different from their

Roman and monastic prototypes. Vows, if they were to be taken at all, were to be dispensable at sight. Vows—monastic ones—are not a sort of obligation which can easily be made to be pleasing or popular to a Protestant assembly. The Archdeacon sought to soften the hard word by confessing his own inability to “see any difference between a vow and a solemn promise”. He also pointed out an argument which his audience would be more ready to appreciate, namely, that to balk the project would be to play into the hands of Rome. Their loss would be Rome’s gain.

That is quite true. To oppose the monastic principle is to put one’s self mentally at war with all Christian antiquity. It is going out of one’s way to make the theory of Anglican historic continuity more hopelessly hopeless. To the Church monasticism is both an ideal and a weapon. As an ideal, it satisfies a sacred yearning in multitudes of generous and devoted souls, who are fired by a love which is irresistible in “finding its way”. If Anglicanism cannot make room for them, they will come to those who can. Then monasticism is a weapon without which a Church militant would feel herself sorely beset in battling with the forces of sin. It is the old sword with which this country was conquered for Christ. It requires to be held in hand, if the conquest is to be kept for Him. That Anglicanism, in this hour of its peril and crisis, should seek to draw it and wield it for Christ, is surely a fact which does credit both to the mind and the heart of its leaders. One may hope, therefore, that they will find amongst their body at least one high priest who will unwrap it from the cloth behind the ephod, and hand it to those who will receive it with the eager zeal of David. “*There is none like that. Give it to me.*”

Would such a gain be Rome’s loss? We may be allowed to doubt it. Let us suppose that Anglicanism succeeds in carrying out its projected establishment of Brotherhoods. Secondly, let us suppose that it further succeeds in finding men in sufficient numbers and with a sufficiently large measure of self-renunciation and the temper of obedience to make the movement a success. Finally, let us suppose—

(we are supposing a great deal!)—that Anglicanism thus succeeds in breaking down the traditional prejudices with which the monastic system is regarded by the masses of the English people. In their success we should read our own. We should feel that the whole outcome of the movement was practically and publicly to refute one of the main theses of the Reformation, and to remove one misunderstanding the more which lies between the One True Church and the mind of the English nation.

The opposition to the scheme of Brotherhoods living in celibacy was heartily voiced by Dr. Ryle, the Anglican Bishop of Liverpool. Archdeacon Farrar had said that not 5 per cent. of the masses were touched by the Church of England. Dr. Ryle joins in the sorrowful admission:—

On one point I entirely agree with Archdeacon Farrar. I admit without reserve that the condition of a vast proportion of the lower orders in many of our large overgrown parishes, both morally and socially, is simply deplorable. It is useless to shut our eyes to it. I dwell in Liverpool, the second city in the Queen's dominions, and I know what I say. There is a state of things in some quarters of all our cities, within a short walk of grand town-halls and palaces, which cries to heaven against England, and is enough to make angels weep. The class of whom I speak, remember, are not infidels or reasoning sceptics, like many of the upper ten thousand in our clubs and squares. Nothing of the kind! the mental position of the immense majority is utter indifference to all religion. They are not touched either by church or chapel. They drift on without Christ, without God, and, of course, without any moral standard. They are rightly called "the dangerous classes" by our French neighbours; and no wonder. For they are a standing danger to Church, and State, and social order. They have nothing to lose by a general scramble, and are always ready to become the prey of those talking meddlers who delight to set labour against capital, to encourage discontent, and to make a living out of the ignorance of their fellow-creatures. These dangerous classes have stirred the heart of Archdeacon Farrar, and I sympathise with him entirely.

With this point of fact, all agreement between the Bishop and the Archdeacon ceased, and the old battle of High Church and Low Church was delivered a main. Brotherhoods were needless. The actual machinery, if well worked

was sufficient. Brotherhoods were impracticable. Men or means in requisite numbers would never be forthcoming. Brotherhoods would be mischievous. They would never fit in with the parochial clergy. Brotherhoods and vows of celibacy were historic failures.

Experience does not favour "will-worship" and self-imposed asceticism. Such things have a great show of wisdom, and are very taking for a season with ignorant and shallow Christians. But they only "satisfy the flesh".

What would such "ignorant or shallow Christians" as St. Basil, St. John Chrysostom, St. Gregory, St. Jerome, St. Augustine, St. Martin, St. Patrick, St. Columba, St. David, St. Benedict, St. Augustine of Canterbury, St. Cuthbert, or St. Bede—all monks and members of monastic brotherhoods—have said could they have been present at Hull and heard the wonderful words of this Anglican Bishop upon the system which was to them the highest ideal of Christianity?

A Canon of the Council of Ancyra in A.D. 314 commands that any one who has vowed virginity and then broken his vow shall be considered as guilty as he who commits bigamy (Canon 18). St. John Chrysostom (before A.D. 374) wrote to a monk who had broken his vows and returned to the world, to tell him that he was an apostate, and that until he did penance he had forfeited all hope of salvation (*Epist. ad Theodorum lapsum*). Evidently between the mind of St. John and the mind of Dr. Ryle the angle of divergence is not far short of a hundred and eighty.

A second paper which came to divide was upon that perpetual Anglican problem—the setting of the "due limits of ritual". The Bishop of Guildford went at once to the heart of the question:—

"And here I am confronted with this difficulty—we want the due limits of ritual defined. But who is to define them?" He contended that the Convocations were the proper bodies to accomplish this work, and he suggested that in accordance with historical precedent there should be a National Synod.

The following was the appeal made by Lord Halifax, President of the English Church Union:—

The Church of England to-day stands at the parting of two ways. Never had she greater opportunities opening out before her ; never, perhaps, did greater dangers seem to imperil her future. How, he asked, in view of the attacks that are being made upon it—it is a question which presses increasingly upon us all—is the faith of Christendom to be defended, except on the basis of “the *quod semper*, the *quod ubique*, and the *quod ab omnibus*”. It will be said, perhaps, that these externals of worship are not essential. I know that they are not essential, but I know also—and it is impossible to ignore the fact—that under existing circumstances, to strike at the ritual is to strike at the doctrine with which that ritual is connected.

The reply to this touching plea was made by the Low Church in the person of Canon Bardsley. His argument was plain and irresistible. He showed that all that Anglicans are now contending for, both in their ritual and what their ritual symbolises, is the very negation of what the Anglican Church herself had done at the Reformation, and meant the introduction of doctrines and practices which the highest authorities of Anglicanism itself had consistently disavowed and repudiated. The Canon had a wealth of historic testimony to prove his thesis.

Bishop Wordsworth, of St. Andrews, says that the minister's position was changed “because the doctrine was changed. At the Reformation the Mass, with its doctrine of sacrifice and adoration, was given up, and Holy Communion introduced. Nothing else will account for the universal disuse of the position formerly used. The change, therefore, was made on principle.” If these weighty words of the Bishop of St. Andrews require any confirmation, it will be found by comparing the service for Holy Communion, either in King Edward's second Liturgy, or in our present Prayer-book, with the Sarum Missal of pre-Reformation times. I will only name one fact, but it is thoroughly characteristic of the difference which runs throughout. In the Sarum Missal we have the word “altar” more than thirty times, whilst in our present, and in King Edward's Second Prayer-book, it does not occur once as describing the Holy Table.

The following is also significant :—

That the Mass, with its doctrine of sacrifice and adoration, was given up, and Holy Communion introduced, is assumed both by Dr. Whitgift (who afterwards became Archbishop of Canterbury), in his controversy with Dr. Cartwright, the Puritan divine, and by Hooker, in regard to the use of the word “priest”. Whilst asserting that

the word is derived from presbyter, Whitgift asks, "What is the use of differing about a word, when we are agreed as to the thing contained in the word? As heretofore use hath made it to be taken for a sacrificer, so will use now alter that signification, and make it to be taken for a minister of the Gospel." Hooker declares that "sacrifice is now no part of the Church ministry," and, "as for the people, when they hear the name, it draweth no more their minds to any cogitation of sacrifice than the name of a senator or an alderman causes them to think upon old age". The late Archbishop Longley, during his last illness, in the charge which he prepared for his clergy, declares that "the obvious aim of our Reformers was to substitute the Communion for the Mass".

If Higher Anglicans love dearly the doctrines and ritual which they hold to be "Catholic," how difficult it must be, in the face of such testimony from within, to believe that unbroken historic continuity can be found for one or the other within the Establishment!

Perhaps the most striking proposition was that which came from the Protestant Archbishop of Dublin on the matter of "Home Re-union". Nonconformists, he held, might be united to the Church provided they accepted the Historic Episcopate. But their ministers? Would they submit to re-ordination? The Archbishop suggests a compromise:—

Upon the one hand, the Historic Episcopate (as distinguished from pronouncement respecting its origin or perpetuation) must be accepted as a basis of all future Church government. Less than this we cannot demand, not merely as a matter of conscience on our own parts, but also because it is only on the observance of this condition that the permanence of organic unity can, in our opinion, be secured. But, on the other hand, while thus requiring that for the future Holy Orders shall in all cases be episcopally conferred, we must not, in my opinion, demand that all existing ministers who have received Orders from other sources shall be re-ordained. I need not adduce the reasons, to my mind conclusive, which learned and loyal members of our own Church have given for the belief that our Church has full power, without any deviation from principle or from precedent, to make this concession. Enough to repeat my own conviction, that unless we can see our way to make it, Home Re-union, so far as we are concerned, must, I fear, be regarded as nothing more than a splendid dream.

Higher Anglicans believe that episcopal ordination is essential to him who consecrates the Eucharist, and that

for a person not so ordained to usurp the sacred function would be a scandalous profanation. Yet here is an Anglican prelate—the representative of the Anglican Church in Ireland—calmly proposing to admit such ministers into his churches, and commit his people to their ministrations. When such a voice is heard from those who hold the helm, may not sincere men who sail in the ship well feel anxious for their safety?

CHAPTER VI.

The “Reconciliation” of St. Paul’s Cathedral.

(25TH OCTOBER, 1890.)

THE public “Reconciliation” of St. Paul’s marks a fresh *étape* in the march of Anglicanism. The fact implies so much latent recognition of Catholic principle, that one is led to believe that the current of Anglican thought is traveling faster and farther than even those who are carried on its breast would be willing to acknowledge. *The Church Times* is abundantly right when it measures the distance covered by comparing the ready facility with which the reconciliation has been conceded and carried out last week, and the impossibility which would have attached to such a proceeding even so late as the last century.

Some foolish persons argue that because suicides have taken place at St. Paul’s before this particular one, and no service of reconciliation has followed, therefore it would have been quite sufficient to have allowed the old bad state of neglect to continue. It shows a remarkable growth in the religious education of the people that the reasonableness and even necessity of the course adopted by the Dean and Chapter have been generally recognised, and that a service, not even attempted before at St. Paul’s in the present century, has become possible under present conditions.

Henceforward, the soul of the “Aggrieved Parishioner” will have a double sorrow to bear. He has had to stand by while the chief Protestant Cathedral in the land—one of the very few that were born and bred in Protestantism—enthroned the Madonna above its high altar. Now he has had

to fold his arms and look on while the whole fabric receives "priestly absolution"! Little wonder if the fact has so worked on his mind that he is prepared to bear witness that he detected some of the City men in the act of worshipping the reredos!

The "Reconciliation" at St. Paul's is marked off from any compromise-like ceremony elsewhere or in previous times by the fact that there was no suspension of celebrations or services between the pollution and the reconciliation. Either it was felt that the stain was not inconsistent with the religious use of the church, or that the services were not of a kind to be seriously affected by the stain, but all went on as before until such time as the Dean and Chapter could conveniently arrange for a service of reconciliation. The tiresome people who thrust logic into all things under the specious names of common-sense or consistency, may be expected to flourish the dilemma that either the pollution rendered the church unfit for service or it did not. If it did, no service should have been held in it. If it did not, then no reconciliation was needed. Such reasoners need to be reminded that the world has to find room for lovers of peace as well as for lovers of principle, and that besides the beauty of logic there is also the beauty of compromise. It is the latter that clothes and gives the charm to that masterly policy which conciliates two opposite sets of minds, leading each to believe that it has substantially gained its point, and that whatever it lacks of finished success is a mere concession to soften the fall of its opponent. Some such solution—and from the facts, it is hard to discover any other—seems to be present in the mind of *The Church Review* :—

It was consonant with the genius of the Church of England, which abhors ostentation, noise and fuss. At the same time, a better and more logical course would have been to have closed the cathedral directly the suicide took place. After there have been daily Eucharists and frequent services for a fortnight, the Office of Reconciliation has the appearance, at least, of unreality, and at best is but a compromise intended to satisfy both the outside world and the natural instincts of people with reverential minds.

The spirit of compromise seems also to have found its way very far into the manner in which the ceremony was carried out. The following was the ritual adopted according to the account given in *The Church Review* :—

The Bishop then advanced, accompanied by his chaplain, to the altar, which was draped only in deep crimson, and bore neither lights nor flowers. Here, with the light only of a single waxen taper falling upon his face and book, he knelt while the Litany was monotoned. After this, the *Miserere* was sung, the alternate verses being taken by the Rev. W. Russell and the choir, with solemn and beautiful effect, as every worshipper under the half-lit dome knelt with bowed heads. There was a brief pause ere the Bishop rose, and standing in the misty gloom, upon the altar steps, recited the sentences in the Commination Service, the choir and congregation joining to make the responses. The Collect from the same office, asking pardon for them “whose consciences by sin are accused,” and the prayer and confession following were next offered by the Bishop, who then said, “Let the Sentence of Reconciliation now be read,” and Mr. Lee again came to the choir rails, and read. . . .

“The operative clause” of the sentence was in the following terms :—

And whereas the said petitioners have humbly besought us to be pleased to pronounce such sentence of reconciliation, and to perform such service within the said cathedral church as may be required by the ecclesiastical laws or may to us seem meet and suitable, therefore, we, the said Frederick, Lord Bishop of London, do, by virtue of and in exercise of our episcopal authority, hereby pronounce, decree and declare the said cathedral church to be exempt and reconciled from all canonical impediment and from every profanation contracted and incurred by or through the afore-said acts of suicide and blood-shedding for ever by this our definite sentence or final decree, which we give and promulge by these presents.

Mr. Lee carried the document he had read to the chaplain, who handed it to the Bishop, who affixed his signature to it, and after the final blessing had been pronounced, the strange office so seldom heard was at an end.

The whole of this ceremony has all the air of being ancient and liturgical. The strange fact is that it is neither one nor the other. No part or period of Christendom ever witnessed such a ceremony as described above, before the Reformation. It may surely be doubted if the compilers of

the Prayer-book ever intended the Communion Service to be pressed into such a purpose. On the other hand, neither the Sarum use which obtained in such cases before the Reformation, nor the form which is given in the Pontifical of Egbert of York (A.D. 732), presents any recognisable likeness to the function in St. Paul's.

The Pontifical of Egbert requires a "Mass of Reconciliation," with appropriate Collects, Secret and Post Communion, and a triple blessing at the end. Another Anglo-Saxon Pontifical, dating from the eighth century, requires the whole church to be thrice sprinkled with holy water, and then certain prayers (found also in Egbert's Pontifical) to be recited.

According to the Sarum use which was followed in England before the Reformation (and which is at most but a modification or variety of the Roman rite) the ceremony would have been as follows:—

1. The Bishop in pontificals would have prostrated himself before the altar while the clergy recited the Litany of the Saints.
2. After the prayers, he would have three times sprinkled the church with holy water (using also as in the Consecration Service, salt, ashes and wine).
3. After a special preface, he would have incensed the church three times.
4. The relics of the saints would then have been borne in procession back to the church from the place to which they had been removed.
5. After certain prayers and the triple blessing, the Bishop would have sung the "Mass of Reconciliation" with its beautiful Introit, and of which the Collect, Secret and Post Communion are the same as given in Egbert's Pontifical.

It is a far cry from the ancient liturgical rite to the modern adaptation carried out by the Bishop of London.

The chief value of the Anglican ceremony is, that it helps to give public recognition to the belief that God can bless places as well as persons, and through the ministry of the Church can restore to both the blessing when lost. That there is an objective holiness or sacredness which God, the Author of all holiness, can attach to things and places, is a belief

which is interwoven with the whole system of Christian worship from Apostolic times. The blessings and exorcisms of the earliest ritual extant bear witness to it. There is much in the temper of the times which is opposed to it. The Broad Church, with its pride of mind and Manichean hatred of matter, seems bent upon ignoring the essential dualism of the plan of the Creation and the Incarnation, and would mutilate both by driving the material out of religion. The Low Church, with its pride of person, seems unwilling to allow God to bless any part of His own work except the soul of the believer, and to resent the "sacerdotalism" by which God deigns to make His gift pass through the human hand of His ministry. Both these schools of religious thought claim to represent Christianity. It is certainly not the Christianity of St. Cyril of Jerusalem, nor of the earliest liturgies, and Christianity, which is modern or amateur rather than historic, forfeits all rational claim to be Catholic. When Anglicanism thus publicly protests against both by an act which formally recognises the objective sacredness of place, it is doing good and sensible service and making one more step to put itself in line with Christian antiquity. Local reconciliation is not, as a rather popular writer has called it, "an importation of the Middle Ages," but a phase and application of a principle—the blessing of things and places as well as persons—which is as ancient as the ceremonies of baptism or the rite of dedication. One can only hope that, now that Anglicanism has secured the recognition of the principle, that, when occasion presents itself, it will learn to give to it a liturgical expression more frank and less feeble than that which marked its ceremonial at St. Paul's Cathedral.

CHAPTER VII.

Altar Against Altar.

(22ND NOVEMBER, 1890.)

LET us be Anglicans just for the space of a few paragraphs. "The Establishment is a true branch of the Holy Catholic

Church. Its bishops are the Catholic episcopate of this land just as truly and as rightfully as are the bishops of Italy, France, or Spain in their respective countries. As bishops of the Catholic Church they alone in this realm hold the sacred authority which belongs to those 'whom the Holy Ghost has appointed to rule the Church of God'. And the Romanists? The nature of their position is obvious. They are intruders and schismatics. In open violation of the Canons of Christian antiquity, they come here to 'set up altar against altar,' and both deny and defy the authority of the lawful Catholic Church of the country. The Bishop of Rome who sends them hither is the author of their intrusion and the abettor of their schism. His action is an open and sustained violation of the ordinary laws of Church government."

Now let us go to Bath. We are at a public meeting. That bishop on one side of the platform is Lord A. C. Harvey (the Anglican, namely, the true, and rightful, Catholic Bishop of Bath and Wells, who condemns the Bishop of Rome, who sets altar against altar, and sends priests of the Romanist schism who come as intruders into this realm and rob the souls which live in the house which the Church built). The dignitary near him is Dr. Wordsworth (the Anglican, namely, the true, rightful Catholic Bishop of Salisbury, who, as above). Now to the business of the meeting. It is only to help, to start, and to support a new and Reformed Church in Italy. The new movement is being inaugurated by Count Campello (not the Catholic Count Campello, but the one who was formerly a priest of the Church of Rome).¹ Count Campello is to work amongst the Italians. A college under an efficient professor is to be founded for training priests to assist the Count in his campaign. This mission is one of ecclesiastical privateering in the territory of the Bishops of Italy.

¹ Count Campello has since returned to the fold of the Catholic Church, and has made a most earnest and edifying abjuration of his errors, and has publicly expressed his deep sorrow for the scandal of his apostasy.

Nothing without the Bishop was the great and ancient rule of Catholic order in Church work. It is based upon the injunctions contained in St. Ignatius's letter to the Catholics of Smyrna in the second century. Count Campello has a work to carry out in more than one diocese of Italy. In every case it will have to be done altogether "without the Bishop". In every case it will have to be done against the Bishop. But Lord A. C. Harvey and Dr. Wordsworth, being Anglican, and therefore Catholic Bishops, cannot consistently approve that! Cannot?

The first-mentioned Bishop takes the chair at the meeting held for the purpose. He addresses it as follows:—

Italy was no longer, as was once sarcastically said, a mere geographical expression. It now expressed a united people of one blood, of one race, and with common political and social interests in the world. All this invested the cause with very great interest, because the more they felt the importance of the position Italy now held in the world as a nation the more they must feel the vital importance of that nation being influenced by the Church of Christ and guided on true Christian principles. Therefore, they felt it to be all the more incumbent upon them as far as it was in their power to help the people to acquire true notions of the Gospel of the Lord Jesus Christ.

He concluded by announcing his willingness to become President of the local branch of the Association formed to support the movement.

Now for one Catholic Bishop—(we are still Anglicans holding the Branch or Province theory as we do the Credo)—to send a priest in amongst the flock of another Catholic Bishop, to work there without the said Bishop's consent, and in defiance of his authority, is an open outrage upon all canonical order. It is ecclesiastical burglary. It is the act of house-breaking applied to a diocese. The fact that it is not knives and spoons but souls that are being raided upon does not go far to lessen the colour of the ecclesiastical felony. When Lord A. C. Harvey puts himself at the head of this adventure one expects Dr. Wordsworth to step in and rescue his fellow-Bishop from the un-Catholic position in which he is plainly placing himself. This is how he does it:—

The Bishop of Salisbury moved: "That the Italian Church Reformers, under Count Campello, are deserving of the deep sympathy and effective support of the members of the Church of England". He said they had heard general principles laid down by their own Bishop, which he was very thankful to hear from him. That was to say, it was no feeling of wishing to intermeddle, but a feeling of real interest on the part of the Church, that the time had now come when they must in public show themselves ready to sympathise with those who were attempting to carry on the cause of the reformation of the Church in Italy. It was always held that Bishops had a double relation, both towards the Church of which they were Bishops and towards the Church universal, that there might be times when it was their duty to come forward to intervene in the affairs of foreign Churches. *At the same time they knew it was an extremely delicate thing to do.* They kept as much as possible in the background, and would willingly give up their interest and interference as far as they had practised it in favour of any qualified person on the spot.

Three things are clear as A, B, C. A. No honest man can hold a principle and publicly advocate its opposite. In political life such a double-dealer would be howled off the hustings. B. Either Anglican bishops, such as Lord A. C. Harvey and Dr. Wordsworth themselves, do not really believe in the principles of the Branch theory and its logical consequences; or C. They believe in those principles, but put them in their pocket, while they preside over a meeting which is held for the express purpose of violating them. In the name of Christian charity, we believe in B. It is happily out of the question to suppose that men like the two prelates mentioned could be believers in the Branch theory, and could, with such a belief in their hearts, stand before the face of the public to play the part of trimmers and hypocrites.

The incident only proves that nothing but Truth can stand the strain of Fact. The kindness of Anglican sympathy is much too honest and robust to be held in bonds by the spinners of theories. At the psychological moment it casts theory to the theorists, and goes out in practical sympathy to the "loneliness" of Count Campello and takes his hand and bids him God-speed in his campaign against the Pope, in tones as hearty and as genuine as those which echoed

from the lips of Luther or Cranmer. Only—to-morrow, they will remember their lesson, and we shall be gravely assured once more that the “‘Venerable Primate of the West’ and his Bishops are the true Catholic authority of the Church of Italy”.

CHAPTER VIII.

Continuity—Letters Old and New.

(22ND NOVEMBER, 1890.)

HERE are extracts from three letters. The first was sent by the Bishop of London, through his chaplain, in November, 1890, to those who took offence at the Reconciliation Service at St. Paul's:—

I am desired by the Bishop of London to write in answer to your letter to say that he does not consider the Church of England to be now, or to have ever been, a branch of the Church of Rome. The Bishop does not think that further explanation is necessary.

Compare this with Letter No. 2. In the year 1246 the Abbots and Priors of England wrote a letter to the Pope. They write as his “devoted sons” and “kissing the blessed feet”. Their witness as to the Church of England in their day is as follows: “Up to this moment glorious things have been said of the ‘City of God,’ namely, of the English Church, which is a *special member* of the *Most Holy Church of Rome*”.¹ Now that is passing strange. These dignitaries of the English Church assure the Pope in an official document that the said English Church is a “special member” of the Church of Rome. One would imagine that they ought to know, considering that they lived at the time and were themselves actual members of the English Church, and high officers in her councils and convocations. One would even imagine that they might know their own religion and the status of their own Church almost as well as the Bishop of London, who writes on the subject some six hundred years after the time. Yet the Bishop of London is able to assure his correspondent that the Church of England “has never been a

¹ Matthew Paris, *Chronica Majora* (Roll Series), vol. iv., p. 531.

branch of the Church of Rome"! How it could never have been a branch (as the Bishop of London says) and yet have been not only a member, but a "special member" of the Church of Rome (as the Abbots and Priors of 1246 declare)—and how the Bishop of London in 1890 can know the position and attitude of the ancient English Church better than the dignitaries of the said Church who lived at the time—well, that we presume is a point upon which it may be said that "the Bishop of London does not think that any further explanation is necessary".

Letter No. 3. The following was sent by the Nobles and Commons of England in 1245 to Pope Innocent IV. (It is noteworthy that it was written at a moment when the realm was exasperated by the monetary exactions of the Curia, and when the amicable relations of England to Rome were upon this matter strained to their uttermost. It therefore registers the temper of English Catholics at the moment when the anti-curial feeling had reached its highest point of pressure.)

"To the Reverend Father in Christ, Pope Innocent, Chief Bishop, the Nobles with the whole commonalty of the realm of England send commendation, with kissing of the blessed feet.

"Our Mother, the Church of Rome we love with all our hearts as our duty is. We are zealous for the increase of her honour with as much affection as we may, as the one to whom we ought always to fly for refuge, whereby the grief lying upon the child may find comfort at the mother's hand. This succour the Mother is found to impart so much the more to her child in the measure that she findeth him kind and generous in relieving her necessity. Neither is it to our said Mother unknown, how beneficial and bountiful a giver this realm of England hath been now and for long time past, for the fuller amplification of her greatness, as appeared by our yearly subsidy, which we call Peter Pence. Now the said Church, not content with this yearly subsidy, hath sent divers legates for other contributions at sundry and divers times, to be taxed and levied out of the said realm, all of which contributions and taxes, notwithstanding, have been lovingly and liberally granted."¹

¹ Matthew Paris, *Chronica Majora* (Roll Series), vol. iv., p. 441.

Trunk and branch—Body and member—Mother and child—which is the more eloquent and expressive living and loving type of relationship?

CHAPTER IX.

The Reception of the Lambeth Judgment.

(6TH DECEMBER, 1890.)

THE Lambeth Judgment, whatever its final effect may be, has served to diagnose the Church of England. The degree in which such qualities as unity or authority are wanting to her constitution has been made plain to the public. The Archbishop had to deliver his Judgment to the two main parties of the Establishment. He spared no effort and left nothing undone to ensure that his Judgment should be full, exhaustive, definite and authoritative.

With what result? The Advanced party, as voiced by *The Church Times*, says a few kind words to thank the Archbishop for all the pains he has taken, but reminds him that the Judgment he has delivered is possessed of "no spiritual validity". And the Low Church party? They repudiate it with a vehemence which is of the practical kind, by taking immediate steps to appeal against it.

Was the Archbishop's Judgment a compromise? *The Church Times* admits that it was:—

We have no right to assume that he has any personal bias, and least of all that he has any Protestant bias. Yet by the force of this tendency the Judgment becomes in effect something of a compromise. We do not impute to the Archbishop the intention of making a compromise. On the contrary, it is probably the result of the necessities of the case arising out of the circumstances in which he found himself placed (*Leading Article*, 28th Nov., 1890).

But Bishop Alford holds that it is not:—

It is with great regret we hear the "Judgment" spoken of as a "compromise". There is nothing in it of the nature of a compromise. Not a single instance of give and take. On the one side, there is no censure as to doctrine or ritual, nothing to gain, nothing to lose, entire satisfaction with the Prayer-book as it stands, a hearty reception of doctrine and acceptance of ritual as interpreted

and used generation after generation with the sanction of Church and State. On the other side, there is organised aggression for the introduction into our churches under the guise of Catholicity of both doctrine and ritual not Catholic but Roman Catholic.

What is the intrinsic merit of the Judgment?

Speaking of the manner in which the Archbishop made out a case for the eastward position, *The Church Times* says :—

The Judgment, as a great work of patient, astute and scrupulously fair historical inquiry and criticism, has already excited, and is pretty sure to retain, the admiration of all impartial readers. No such exhaustive treatment of the questions has been achieved before, and it is not too much to say that in all probability the Archbishop's Judgment will be the last word on the subject, as far as history is concerned, for a long time to come.

But *The Church Intelligencer* gives a long and minute analysis of the Judgment, and concludes :—

The rest of the Judgment is equally remarkable for the badness of its "law," citing for instance the case of St. Gregory's as a valid precedent, the true "history" of which will be found given above at page 84. It would, however, require a bulky pamphlet to enumerate all the mistakes and mis-statements of fact, and erroneous suggestions of inference involved in the Judgment. So far from adducing much "new light," it is remarkable for the mere *réchauffé* which it furnishes of materials from Chambers, Scudamore, and Morton Shaw. Space failing, we must perforce quit the subject with the remark that to leave matters where they now stand would involve grave evils to the Church at large.

Was it honest? *The English Churchman* says :—

If this mode of reasoning were generally adopted it would not be difficult to set aside the entire decalogue. In fact it is, in principle, that which was condemned by our Lord when He spoke of making void the Commandments.

It adds :—

We almost marvel that an Archbishop could, with a grave countenance, even read a Judgment which denies the singing of the *Agnus Dei* at this particular part of the service has "any association with those Roman doctrines or practices which the Church of England repudiates".

Was the Archbishop's Court a competent and spiritual one? *The Church Review* holds that it was :—

In the first place, the Court was a spiritual one, and, therefore, peculiarly suitable for such questions as those involved in the case.

The Church Times argues that it was not :—

The success of the Archbishop's endeavour to provide a peaceful solution of the dispute about ritual depends upon the acceptance of the Judgment by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council when the questions come before it either in appeal from this decision, or in any future case that may come before it in the brief space that we hope remains before its place is taken by a competent Ecclesiastical Court.

The above are possibly after all minor points upon which various appreciations and interpretations are all but inevitable. Upon the main point—whether it ought to be recognised, received and obeyed—there is practical unanimity. The unanimity is that it ought not.

The Church Times says :—

We do not like to appear to receive ungraciously a Judgment which is in all essential points favourable to those whom we represent ; but we feel it our duty still to be careful to maintain that the Judgment is of no spiritual validity (*Leading Article*, 28th Nov., 1890).

Again :—

We therefore refuse to regard the Judgment as an official and binding utterance of the Archbishop, and we proceed to discuss it as his Grace's personal opinion and nothing more, although as such it must and ought to have great weight and receive very serious consideration.

Bishop Alford, representing the Low Church, says :—

I conclude, therefore, that the Lincoln Judgment does not (if not appealed against) affect the Church of England in its decisions. The ecclesiastical jurisdiction of the Reformed and Established Church of England has no affinity with Papal authority, nor does she possess a Canon Law distinct from Imperial legislation. Besides, in this instance, the Court itself failed to secure unanimity among its assessors ; the voice of the English episcopate was neither sought nor heard ; the Convocations of Canterbury and York were not consulted ; the laity were ignored ; Parliament unrecognised ; the Queen (as yet) nowhere ! Under these circumstances is it not illusive to regard the Judgment (if not appealed against before Privy Council) as binding the Church of England throughout all her dioceses at home and abroad and for ever ? Can this be the case ?

The Record points out the immediate need of appealing to the Privy Council, and says:—

This is the point where the authority of the Archbishop's Court sinks into comparative insignificance, and where the need of a Court of properly trained judges is very much felt. We have warned our readers from the outset that the Lincoln prosecution meant trouble for the Church of England, and the outlook is not clearing; but none the less it seems to us that loyalty to the truth and justice to our children require that these grave questions—we refer especially to altar lights and the singing of the *Agnus*—should not continue moot points, but should be sifted to the bottom. In other words, we regard an appeal to the Final Court as the inevitable sequel to the Archbishop's marked disagreement with the previous decisions of that tribunal.

The Protestant Alliance has passed a resolution expressing their hopes that the "pernicious portions of the Archbishop's Judgment may be reversed" when an appeal is made to "Her Majesty, as Supreme Ordinary".

The Bishop of Guildford, addressing a meeting of Churchmen in Council, urged upon them the necessity of patience, and above all, besought them not "to suppose that everybody is going to conform to the Judgment at once".

In the meantime the Low Church is busy getting ready its appeal "to the Supreme Ordinary," while *The Church Times* makes—very safely we think—its appeal to the "Church at large," and declares that certain Church customs of ritual (points which the Archbishop vainly thought he had settled) are of Catholic observance and can be prohibited "by no Anglican authority".

These are points of Catholic usage which no part of the Church can decide for itself, and which, therefore, no Anglican authority could forbid.

That is very high ground. Is there not a statute of *præmunire* to punish those who carry ecclesiastical appeals out of this country? Then we have been told so often that the Church of England was a "National Church," absolutely "free and independent of foreign control". Now it turns out that in all important matters of worship and ritual the Church of England is to be governed and controlled by the

usage of the "Church at large," namely, by a body, of which the vastly preponderating majority, and with it the deciding authority, must always be outside of England. Only minor details are to be left to the discretion of "any Anglican authority". One cannot but draw a long sigh of relief at this breaking down of the theory of insularity in which the Establishment has been ice-bound since the days of the Reformation. When England once begins to look for its standards of religion across the Channel, it may be trusted some day or other to look over the Alps, and her heart may turn to the old spot where she knelt and prayed in the centuries gone by. After all, minds must grow weary in finding that the "Church at large" is a mute abstraction of Anglican theorists, connoting an informal mass of distracted religious opinion. The living teaching concrete unity around the Chair of Peter is what the soul of Anglicanism is unconsciously yearning for. Nor will it rest until it finds it.

CHAPTER X.

The Lesson of the Lambeth Judgment.

(13TH DECEMBER, 1890.)

THE expected happened. The Lambeth Judgment resulted in a compromise. The Archbishop had before his tribunal practically the two main representative sections of the Establishment. The Church Association was there under the figure-head of "Read and Others". And the English Church Union was there in the person of the Bishop of Lincoln. The Archbishop had laid before him seven points for decision. The problem has been a long and a hard one. He has worked it out—and with a leisurely liberality in the matter of time which might have excited the jealousy of the Roman Congregations. He has steered his way so evenly between the seven points, that he has left four upon the one side and three upon the other. Seven is an odd number, and better could not have been expected. Ablutions, eastward position, the *Agnus Dei*, and the altar lights, go to the Bishop of Lincoln. But the public mixing of the chalice

(not the chalice mixed in the sacristy beforehand), the virtual concealment of the manual acts at consecration, and the signing of the Cross at Absolution or final blessing, are condemned, and pass as so many points gained to the credit of the Church Association.

The Archbishop has drawn his line fairly down the middle, and, it seems to us, by using a double standard. There is the Reformation standard, which admits or excludes according to the mind of the Reformers expressed in the composition and rubrics of the Prayer-book. There is the Catholic Antiquity standard, which accepts or rejects according to the primitive usage of the Church. If the Archbishop had used either standard singly, one of the two parties would have had it all their own way, and the other would have been utterly discomfited. That "might be legal but it would not have been expedient". But by using judiciously both standards the verdict is divided, a working compromise is achieved, and the litigant parties are sent away, either equally satisfied or equally dissatisfied as the case may be.

Thus, by an appeal to the Antiquity standard, the Bishop of Lincoln is assured that he may keep his altar candles burning. But *en revanche* (here the Archbishop lays down the Antiquity and takes up the Reformation standard), he is told that he must stand out of the way and let the people see what he is doing at the consecration. Now, as a matter of fact, there is good reason for holding that the use of altar lights at Mass is not nearly so ancient or so primitive as the concealment of the elements. Far from insisting on the people being allowed to see what was being done at the consecration, the ancient usage insisted on precisely the opposite, and was so much in earnest about the matter that it very practically enforced its point by causing a curtain or veil to be drawn at the consecration, for the express purpose of concealing both the priest and the elements.

It was only a considerable time after the consecration that the curtain or veil was withdrawn and the consecrated elements exposed to the worship of the people. St. John

Chrysostom teaches his people in the fourth century that "we taste of the Body which is adored by the angels," and adds, "when the Sacrifice is borne forth—and Christ, the Lamb of the Lord, is sacrificed . . . and when thou seest the curtains drawn back, then think that the sky above us is opened, and that angels are descending" (Hom. in Ephes., iii. 5).

However, average Protestant public opinion can, if need be, stand the altar candles, but not the curtain nor even the back of the celebrant, so the Bishop of Lincoln gets his lights, but to appease the Reformers he must learn to stand aside and conform to the unpatristic, unprimitive practice of an exposed consecration.

The Lambeth Judgment—*quâ* Lambeth—is over. Only the historical lesson or significance of the event remains. One part of the impression left behind is a pleasant one. In the Anglican body the trial has been an event of the first magnitude. Nothing but a vast volume of religious earnestness upon all sides—both in the litigant parties involved and in the public at large—could have made it so. The country and the period in which a *cause célèbre* of national importance is fought out over the reading of a rubric can hardly go down to posterity charged with the great nineteenth-century sin of religious indifference.

On the one side, under the brusque exterior of its unlovely Protestant vehemence, the Low Church is conspicuous by its honesty. It has a filial love for the Reformation and the Reformers, and—small blame to it—it zealously and loyally defends what it loves. It wants Ridley's Candle—not the Roman one. Then its position has been a trying one, and is likely to become more so. It feels that we and the inevitable Jesuits are standing behind the Ritualists, whispering into their ears, and guiding their hands. (If we are not, our doctrines are.) We teach these allies our insidious beliefs, our drill and our tactics, with a thousand and one pretty practices, and then throw them out in front of us as skirmishers. Thus spiritually they act as the irregular forces—the light auxiliaries fighting side by side with the

legions of Rome. They penetrate the outworks of Protestantism. They capture the altars and the pulpits. They plant wherever they go the old flag of the Mass and the Confessional. It is not in Protestant human nature to see all that and be silent! The Low Church, in face of such an invasion, waxes wrathful in its zeal, and that it should do so is only a proof that it believes what it professes, and loves what it believes. Even when it finds a moment to look over the heads of the offending Ritualists and to tell us never so plainly how heartily it detests us, as the real and original cause of the trouble (as it did in a recent manifesto), we cannot but feel refreshed by the ring of sterling King David-like vigour and honesty which vibrates in every word of the pious imprecation. The fact that the Low Church, even in the face of odds, is resolved to do battle for its beliefs from Court to Court, even up to the steps of the Throne, is public proof—if proof were needed—that its religious honesty is unquestionable, and that its practical energy is equal to its honesty.

The case for the Ritualist side would be made out, not perhaps on other grounds, but from another point of view. Their position has a very real claim upon the consideration of Catholics. Our Mother, the Catholic Church, the Spouse of Christ, is divinely fair. She "wounds hearts," as the inspired writer says of her, "in one of her eyes". Her heavenly beauty and queenly grace make themselves felt even when seen from afar, and by those who are not of her household. Souls that have once seen the Vision and felt the charm can never be as if they had not seen it nor felt it. They are irrevocably disillusioned from what they feel to be the hopelessly selfish and narrow ideals of the Reformers. They are never more likely to be held in bonds by the thirty-nine leading strings of the Anglican Reformation. To love what is Catholic becomes a spiritual passion, and prompts them to realise it in their souls and in their surroundings. That a struggle to force the ideal to fit into the actual personal and national framework should result in an adaptation that is inconsistent and unhistorical, is only something to be expected. That men who have seen so

much should not have light, or perhaps always the clearness of light which means courage, to see their way further, and to find the Church where alone the Church can be found—with *Peter*—is pity enough to make angels weep. But even so, there is much to make us rejoice. That so many of these wandering children should feel the unconscious heart-yearning for their true Mother; that they should love her even from afar; that they should feel the joy of her doctrines and the irresistible winningness of her ways; that they should kiss her very shadow upon their desolate altars, and love to adore “in the place where her feet have stood”—all that to us is surely matter for sympathy, gladness and thanksgiving. Catholics who love the Church, and who are blessed in possessing what these lost ones are wistfully seeking, have a mission to help, rather than to blame them, when their yearnings lead them into ways that are less than logical, and into conduct that is less than consistent, or even into devices which, judged by legal standards, seem less than just. The Lambeth Judgment registers the rising influence of this new religious ethos—not Catholic, but philocatholic—and while we never forget for a moment that heresy is heresy, and irredeemably hateful as such, and while we feel that usurpation and simulation of the Church’s title and claim are things which the charity of truth can never permit us to condone, we can afford to give the aspirations of a new generation so evidently in good faith, and “seeking the face of God,” a place in our hearts and a happy record in our memory. With such evidences around us we can look hopefully ahead, and at the risk of allowing our hearts to play the prophet, we can trust that England before the coming century has reached its close may see a noon-day of Catholic light and practice of which we were worthy to witness but the dawning.

Leaving the Lambeth Judgment considered in its relation to Anglicans, and passing to the same considered in its relation to Anglicanism, the reflections which arise from it are of a much less agreeable kind. The lesson most plainly taught by the event to the public at large, is the utter hollowness and helplessness of the system which

produced it. I explain. To begin with, there is a want of honesty of method. Why, for instance, should the whole fabric of these huge proceedings be constructed upon a disguised underthought or *arrière pensée*? Everybody knows—but by tacit agreement nobody apparently dares to speak his thought—that the whole of this trial is a battle, not of ritual, but of *belief*. Why, in the name of English and Christian candour, are the issues not straightforwardly stated and plainly pleaded as such? The Church Association, and all that section of the Establishment which for the purposes of the late trial was labelled “Read and Others,” know perfectly well in their heart of hearts that when they attacked the Bishop of Lincoln it was not that they cared a button of his cassock whether he stood eastward or westward, or mixed his chalice, or lighted his candles; but what *does* matter to them, and matter much, is that he should seek to do what they are determined he shall not, namely, bring back the doctrine of the Mass and transubstantiation into the Church of England in reversal of the work of the Reformation. And the Bishop who is thus attacked knows equally well that it is not the symbols, but the doctrines which underlie the symbols, that are at stake in his impeachment. The Archbishop, who sits in judgment upon both, knows it better than either, and all England knows it with him. Then upon this basis of knowledge we have a long public trial extending over several weeks, learned counsel pleading for days at a time, the Archbishop maturing his decision for months, and then producing a judgment which requires no less than five hours to deliver. And yet, in all the indictments, in the pleadings, in the judgment, never even once is the question of *belief* directly alluded to! Can any one explain the mystery? *Belief* is the question which is at the root of the whole proceedings. It is the question which alone is of synodical importance. It is the question which is deepest in everybody’s heart and uppermost in everybody’s mind. And yet, by common consent, all agree quietly to pass it over untouched and unmentioned, and fight the whole battle, if battle must be fought, over such wretched counters as minutiae of rubrics and ritual.

Such a fiasco is just all that is opposed to the dignity and reality of Apostolic or Canonical procedure. What would a Synod of Bishops in the fourth or fifth century have said of such a conspiracy of doctrinal timidity and evasion? Their ecclesiastical vocabulary, rich as it was, would not easily have found a word sufficiently expressive of contempt for such a pitiful system of *οἰκονομία*. Their first question to the Bishop of Lincoln would have been—What do you *believe* on the points at issue? Brought before *them*, there would have been no disingenuous tabooing of the crucial question of belief, nor would they have suffered for a moment any fencing round the real issue. They would have tackled it at once, and with Christian courage and candour, they would speedily have drawn up a special creed-formula on the points mooted, and tested the accused by asking him to accept and profess it. They would thus have decided the question for him and for all others by a clear and unmistakable doctrinal judgment, sanctioned by an anathema to fall upon those who would fail to receive and obey it. The matter of belief once settled, matters of rubric would naturally settle themselves. That is primitive Christian procedure in its noble straightforwardness, and anything more utterly unlike the Lambeth method could not easily be imagined.

But it may be urged, and with undoubted reason, that the Archbishop could not be expected to enter into the fundamental or under-question of doctrine. In these days of divided opinions such things cannot be easily or prudently done. The defining of Articles of Faith, outside of Catholic unity, has become anachronic and impracticable. Both sections represented in this trial have much too large a standing room in the Establishment for one easily to displace the other. (The Arian would have danced for joy if that principle of consideration for numbers had only been known in his day. Had it had a place in the procedure of Christian antiquity we should never have been troubled by the Nicene Creed.) The Reformation has practically landed all religious organisations formed on its basis into a paralysis of doctrinal judgment, by which the tongue of their Churches is powerless to decide with authority any question of faith—even to teach

men the meaning of the most elementary Christian rite, or to tell them what substance they receive when they go to Holy Communion. Hence it is that in appreciating the outcome of the Lambeth trial, to the note of hollowness as shown by the evasion of the question of faith, we have to add the note of helplessness, which alone justifies and explains it. Its voice to the nation is pitiful. "Anglicanism cannot tell it whether the Mass is the 'Propitiatory Sacrifice of the New Law' or a 'blasphemous fable'—nor can it even say whether the Sacrament is Christ's true Body to be adored of the faithful or bread and wine which it is idolatry to worship—it may be one or the other!—but the Primate can decide whether or not it is in accordance with precedent to light candles on the altar, or whether the minister can mix a drop of water with the wine in the chalice, or whether he can make the sign of the cross in blessing the people." Truly the Lambeth Judgment is eloquent—eloquent in showing, not what an Anglican Primate of all England can do, but how much there is that he dare not do, and how much trouble he must take in not doing it.

Compare all this very unreal and unprimitive—shall we say, very un-English?—trifling with the straightforward manliness with which English Bishops dealt with these very questions before the Reformation.

"Answer me shortly," said Archbishop Arundel, in 1407, to a priest who was suspect of Lollardism, "believest thou that after the consecration of this foresaid Sacrament there abideth substance of bread or not?" The priest faltered and equivocated, and had ample time during some years of imprisonment to reflect on the futility of his equivocation. The English Church by the voice of her Primate and his fellow-bishops in 1413 (a century and half before Trent), dealing with the powerful courtier, Sir John Oldcastle, went again straight and plainly to the point, and to the very heart of the question:—

"The sayth and determination of holy churche touchyng the Blissfull Sacrament of the auter is this: that after the Sacramentall wordes ben sayde by a prest in hys Masse, the material bred that was bifore is turned into Christ's verryay Body, and the material wyn that was bifore is turned into

Christ's verray blode, and so there leweth no material brede ne material wyn, the wych wer ther byfore the seying of the Sacramental wordes *How lyve ye this article?* "

This is followed up with a still more irresistible test question:—

"Christ ordeined Saint Petir the Apostell to ben his vicarie here on erthe, whos see ys the Church of Rome; ordeyning and graunting the same power that he gaf to Petir shuld succede to all Petirs successours, the wych we callyn now Popes of Rome, by whos power in churches particuler special ben ordeyned prelates, as archbysshoppes, bysshoppes, curates, and other degrees, to whom all Cristen men ought to obey after the lawes of the Church of Rome. This is the determination of Holy Church. *How fele ye this articule?* "

(Wilkins' *Concilia*, iii., 355).

Had the present Archbishop any real continuity with the traditions of the Catholic primates who sat in the Chair of St. Augustine, or with the Catholic synods of antiquity, instead of wasting time and strength over "six points" of rubric and ritual, he would have drawn up six plain articles of belief—the teaching of the Church of England upon the Sacrifice of the Mass—the Real Presence, Confession, Priestly Absolution, Invocation of Saints, and Prayers for the Dead—and with this statement in his hand, he would have asked the Bishop of Lincoln after each "The sayth and determination of Holy Churche is this. *How fele ye this articule?* " In such a method, honesty, reality, Apostolic courage, Christian candour, and English straightforwardness would all have been there. As it is, where are they?

CHAPTER XI.

Divisions and Eccentricities.

(20TH DECEMBER, 1890.)

ANGLICANISM is a system of divided thought, and therefore of divided action. At the present moment it is confronted by an incident which shows how this evil of dividedness pursues it wherever it goes, even to the ends of the earth.

Bishop Blyth is the Anglican "Bishop of Jerusalem and the East". He has been living and labouring in the city which he has annexed to his title. Now, as Anglicanism is loud in its recognition of the rightful jurisdiction of the Orthodox Churches of the East, according to Anglican principles there ought to be no such bishopric at Jerusalem, and Dr. Blyth ought never to have gone there. His very presence, much more his title, is a permanent intrusion and insult to the Orthodox Patriarch and a standing stultification of the principles which Anglicans are never wearied of professing to their Eastern friends. *The Church Times* appreciates and recognises this initial difficulty :—

The whole history of the Jerusalem bishopric is painful to the Anglican mind ; and no wonder. The origin of the venture is told in Newman's *Apologia*, and every student of that work is familiar with the account there given of the effect produced by it upon the Tractarians. It was to them a scandal ; and in the case of Newman at least it was one of the predisposing causes which impelled him Romewards (*Leading Article*, 12th Dec., 1890).

It sums up the subsequent history of this Eastern venture as follows :—

Three bishops, Gobat, Alexander and Barclay, lived, reigned and died. . . . They only succeeded in inflicting upon the Eastern Church all but irreparable damage. They prejudiced her cause in respect of her relation to the Orthodox Communion of the East. Small wonder that Greek Christians in Jerusalem have had in the past some difficulty in recognising the Catholicity of the Anglican Communion.

Not long ago this remarkable see was vacant. One might naturally ask—if Anglicans really regarded this bishopric as an ecclesiastical *monstrum*, why did not they protest against an attempt to fill up the vacancy?

They did so.

The Church Times having stated "that it was with a feeling of relief" that Churchmen hailed the prospect of its discontinuance, adds :—

But they went farther ; they urged that the time was come to make the bishopric cease altogether. . . . No more representative and more typical assembly of English Churchmen can well be imagined than that which disapproved the action ultimately taken by his Grace (namely, in consecrating and sending out a new bishop).

But in that case—in view of the contradiction between such a bishopric and Anglican principles; and in view of the disapproval of the “representative and typical assembly of English Churchmen”—it would be impossible that any loyal Anglican could be found to accept it!

Not at all. Dr. Blyth is an Anglican. *The Church Times* gives him its recognition:—

“He is an able man, fearless and outspoken, and thoroughly Catholic.”

He accepted it and went.

Once there, and placed in a most un-Anglican position, Dr. Blyth did his best to act up to his Anglican principles—not to the rigour of their logical conclusions, for that would have been to return home, but to make matters work smoothly with the Eastern Bishops. His rôle seems to have been not so much that of a missionary Bishop as of an Anglican representative at the see of the Orthodox Patriarch.

This is expressed in other words by *The Church Times*:—

He has made the heads of the Greek Church understand that the Anglican Church is not a Protestant sect, that it regards the claims of the Orthodox Communion with unfeigned respect, has no wish to interfere with its mission, and condemns the proselytising of some of its own irresponsible and self-appointed agents. Dr. Blyth has determinedly kept himself strictly within his own boundaries; and his position, so far as he himself is concerned, is at any rate understood by the Orthodox Bishops.

Now comes the enemy of discord. The agents of the Church Missionary Society are not the least in the world men of that type of Anglicanism which includes Dr. Blyth and *The Church Times*. They are at work in and around Jerusalem. They abhor the beliefs and practices of the Eastern Churches, especially with regard to the Mass and the Blessed Virgin, as superstition and idolatry. They consistently strive to make converts from the subjects of the Patriarch. The Patriarch protests, and as these agents are nominally under Dr. Blyth, the position becomes unpleasant and untenable. It is useless for Dr. Blyth to remonstrate with the missionaries that their action is in violation of Anglican principles. They do not believe in the

alleged Anglican principles, and are not likely to consent to be hindered and hampered in their work by the theories of the English Church Union. Nor can the Bishop send them away. They were there before he came, and they are sent and paid by the Church Missionary Society. Thus the battle of Low Church and High Church is virtually transferred to Jerusalem—and worst of all—to be fought out under the sharp eyes of the Easterns! The crisis is thus graphically stated by *The Church Times* :—

The C.M.S. has in its hands the appointments to most of the chaplaincies. It is jealous of the Bishop, and ignores him when and where it can. It conceives its true mission to be to the Greek Christians, not, as it really is, to the Mohammedans. It encourages ardent proselytising. It excites jealousy and suspicion of the Anglican Communion, and it is doing less good in consequence to the cause of education than it did formerly. Under this last head the damage done is grievous. Dr. Blyth shows by statistics that in the schools of the C.M.S. there are, as a rule, few non-Christian children, and in two particular ones absolutely none. The cause of Christianity is thus exhibited to the Mohammedan world as torn by factions which prey upon one another, the C.M.S. being more eager to convert Greeks from Orthodox Christianity to Calvinism or Lutheranism than to win the Moslem to Christ.

The same organ thus sums up the entire position :—

To sum up the state of affairs, there is, on the one hand, a Bishop of the Anglican Church representing in his views and character and policy her best traditions, cultivating friendly relations with the Orthodox Church, making the Greeks to understand our true position, eager and ready to prevent proselytising, and wishing to turn the energies of the C.M.S. against Mohammedanism. On the other hand, he is nominally ruler of a body of workers who are not appointed by him, who for the most part are out of sympathy with him, who pursue a different policy, and show but scant deference to him even in such matters as the curious constitution of affairs has left in his hands. It would seem that the episcopal office is thus stultified. And whatever good Dr. Blyth may do in a personal way in his intercourse with Greeks is counterbalanced by the spectacle of so-called Episcopalians ignoring the claims of their Bishop. Either the C.M.S. must let the Bishop be truly a Bishop, or Dr. Blyth will be forced to abandon a position which has become untenable.

Truly Anglicanism has found a child of sorrow in its Jerusalem bishopric.

CHAPTER XII.

Double-Dealing in Worship.

(3RD JANUARY, 1891.)

CHRISTMASTIDE is the season of Fairy Tales. May I try to tell one?

I have no doubt that in the days of happy memory the reader has been told of the Fairy Godmother who—once upon a time—was possessed of a magic wand. And whosoever was touched therewith upon the forehead was forced to tell the whole truth, and to speak out—or write down—his whole mind, just as he felt it at first thought and without reserve. When the subject had turned himself mentally inside out, a second touch of the wand checked the flow of revelation, and restored him to his original state of discretion. That is the theme, and the chain of situations created by the wand-touching is, by immemorial prescription, left to the choice of the teller. We claim the privilege.

In the closing days of 1890 Archbishop Benson sat in his study at Lambeth, pen in hand, ready to write a Pastoral to his clergy. Whereupon the mischievous fairy appeared and applied her wand. The spell worked at once, and the Archbishop forthwith wrote as follows:—

“It is my painful duty to have to deal in the Church of England with two distinct sets of doctrines.

“There is set A, which maintains the Propitiatory Sacrifice of the Mass, and the Real and Objective Presence of Christ in the Sacrament. There is set B, which denies that Christ ever instituted any such sacrifice, holds such a belief to be an outrage against the completeness of the Atonement, and repudiates the Real and Objective Presence as superstition and idolatry. For general purposes, these rival sets might have been called in the concrete High Church and Low Church, or, for specific purposes, they may be called the English Church Union and the Church Association. Names matter but little. What does matter is that they are two great antagonistic realities. Were it merely a matter of believing, nothing would be simpler and easier

than to allow each to enjoy its own beliefs in peace, and to call ourselves 'comprehensive' for doing so. But the point where the trouble—endless trouble!—enters in, is that each set has its own way of celebrating the Church service.

"Set A, in order to declare to the world that it believes in the above-named doctrines—Sacrifice of Mass and Real Presence—celebrates the service with lights, incense, vestments and genuflections. And set B, to show that it denies them—as Cranmer and the Reformers denied them—accepts the Prayer-book in the spirit in which Cranmer and the Reformers framed it, and advisedly excludes and eschews all and every ritual accompaniment that would imply the idea of Sacrifice or Christ present in the Sacrament.

"Each set has its own method, and to each set its method is simply the flag of its doctrines.

"Now they called upon me to judge between them. I was not asked to settle their doctrinal beliefs. Nor would either party have flinched by a hair's-breadth from their position if I had. But I was privileged to adjudicate upon some details as to how much each party might show of its flag—certain points in the celebrating of the service.

"Consequently, I must address them as follows: I am willing to trust to your unity and loyalty. What method shall you follow? In the first place, you need not make any changes at all. But if you find that your congregation is practically unanimous on the matter, you can—within the limits of the Judgment—adopt the ornate method A (which expresses belief in doctrines of Sacrifice and Real Presence). But if you do, you must be careful to provide at the same time, for those who want it, a service according to method B (which denies them). You will bear in mind that method B, the 'simpler method,' is true to the Prayer-book, and as a true pastor (while adopting at other times method A), you will delight in following method B for the benefit of those who believe in it, like it, and claim it."

Now here the fairy applied the restorative touch. The document written under the spell was not given to the public. That which later on saw the light was differently worded.

All the plain statement as to the opposed sets gave place to an excellently tempered optimism which gracefully covered the rents, and gratefully accepted certain unities of the Church of England as compensation for her disunities.

All that was said and felt as to the Judgment is compressed and subindicated as follows:—

The Judgment speaks for itself. It would be out of place for me to expand, compress or re-state its conclusions. I am ready to trust the living spirit of unity and loyal faithfulness among us.

Coming to what the lawyers call the “operative clauses,” we have the following:—

As to the particular observances which the Judgment of the Court has found allowable, I feel confident the clergy of the diocese will be with me when I make it my own undoubting recommendation and earnest request that the clergy will make no changes in the direction of adopting any of them in their conduct of Divine service, unless, at the least, they are first assured of the practical unanimity of their people in desiring such change.

(Which being interpreted means: Do not light your candles, or mix your chalice, or sing the *Agnus Dei*, or put up flag A generally unless a preponderating number of your people are with you.)

Next, in the event of such adoption, we have a provision in behalf of set B (the plain people):—

And that, even if any do, in accordance with the clear sentiment of their people, make any change within the limits of the Judgment, yet they will make it their bounden duty to provide at the most convenient hours, especially on the first Sunday of the month, and at the most frequented hour, administration of the Holy Communion which shall meet in all ways the desire of those parishioners whose sense of devotion seeks and feeds on the plain and quiet solemnities in which they have been reared, which they love, and in which their souls most perfectly “go in and out and find pasture”.

That means, while the mass of your people adopt the doctrines and practices of set A, remember that there may

be a section who believe exactly the opposite. You will have to minister for both, and be A to the A and B to the B.

Finally, it concludes with a justificatory plea for the B people :—

Those simplest forms are liturgically true. The people have a right to them, and through them the true pastor will delight to be one with them, to break for them the Bread of Heaven, to feast with them on its inmost spiritual realities. He will fear no loss when, like his Master, he girds himself to serve them and pay them all observance.

Far be it from us to imply that the Archbishop is insincere. On the contrary, the whole Pastoral—(save a rather petulant digression about ourselves)—is decidedly eirenical, and bespeaks an earnest effort to calm troubled waters and guide all for the best in a position of difficulty and responsibility. The insincerity is not in the Archbishop, but inherently and impersonally in the Anglican system, which harbours yes and no under the same formularies. This insincerity of system in the shape of inconsistency is being perpetually projected into the acts and facts of Anglicanism. It is natural that in speaking to Anglicans of Anglican difficulties, the Archbishop should make use of Anglican locutions. It is equally natural that these locutions should be of a kind to soften rather than to sharpen the hard edges which demarcate Anglican differences. They are very properly intended to drape, and not to denude, the angularities of its frame-work. If we have ventured to translate a few of them into that fairy-wand language (which not all of us find it at all times convenient to speak), it is merely that our concern, as outsiders, is with the facts in their simplest religious import, and plainest outcome for our own information, and in nowise with the motives or intentions, least of all with the domestic controversies of either the writer of the Pastoral or those to whom it is written.

But a far more serious side of the incident is a question of ecclesiastical ethics. We are vividly conscious of the

consequences which have so often overtaken Anglican writers who have undertaken, with the courage of *amateurs*, to construe passages from our books of Canon Law or Theology. Mindful of such dangers, we cannot but feel much diffidence in attempting across the pale any exact interpretation of Anglican utterances. Such interpretations are generally affected by side-lights, corporate traditions, or local knowledge in which a Catholic can hardly be supposed to share. We are bound, therefore, to make the amplest correction for parallax, before accepting the passages given above, as the basis of an argument, much less of an accusation. But, after all, plain English has usually a plain meaning. I invite the reader's attention to the clauses quoted from the Pastoral, and beg that he will turn them over, and see whether, by any means, he can honestly deduce from them any other meaning than the following. It contains a Direction. The Archbishop allows his clergy to hold a High Church service, within the limits of the Judgment (namely, with lights, previously mixed chalice, singing of *Agnus Dei*, etc.), but enjoins that the clergyman who makes use of this ritual shall on one Sunday in the month hold a Low Church Service, or, at least, for the benefit of those who prefer it, a simpler service, in which these points are advisedly left out. If there is anything strained or unfair in this reading of the Pastoral, all that I construct upon it, of course, falls to the ground, and is withdrawn by anticipation. But assuming that the above represents the mind of the Archbishop, let us see what his Direction means morally and practically.

Here is a High Church Vicar who has just received the Archbishop's Pastoral. He is a member of the English Church Union and the confraternity of the Blessed Sacrament. Sincerely and conscientiously he believes in the Eucharist as the Propitiatory Sacrifice of the New Law, and in the Real Presence of Christ. (If we are to credit the High Church organs there are many such.) He believes both of these doctrines to be a precious part of the Catholic Faith, which, in loyalty to Christ, he can neither by thought, word or act, doubt, dissemble or deny, at peril of his soul's salvation. He teaches these doctrines eloquently from his

pulpit. He teaches them from the sanctuary, with the higher eloquence of liturgy, by the lights, the incense, the priestly vestments, and, above all, by his practical homage and deportment towards Christ, whom he believes to be present on his altar. All this the Archbishop's Judgment apparently allows, or can be construed to allow.

Now here comes the crux. On one Sunday of the month the Archbishop commands him to become, so to speak, another man. There is a section of his flock who fiercely hate and deny these very doctrines which he loves and cherishes as the "Faith Catholic". For one Sunday per month he must become outwardly and publicly one of them. For he must minister according to their mind, and elementary religious honesty requires unanimity between the minister and those for whom he ministers. He believes that the service is the Sacrifice of the New Law. He is to put aside all Sacrificial vestments, put out the lights, and conduct it in a way which was both arranged and used and intended for the express purpose of denying that it is a Sacrifice at all. He believes that his Master, Christ, is present in the Sacrament. But to suit these non-believers, *he* is to dissemble this belief, and to act in a way expressly designed to be the public and practical and liturgical denial of His Presence. He knows and his people know that these ceremonial adjuncts were suppressed at the Reformation for the very purpose that their suppression might sternly express a public denial of the doctrines they symbolised. He is now asked, while holding the doctrines, to fall in with the suppression, and *pro tanto* with the expression of denial. He is to treat externally what he believes to be Christ as a mere piece of blessed bread, and to withhold from Him publicly the slightest act of recognition or act of adoration. In other words, he is to worship what he believes to be the Real Presence with those who worship it, and outwardly deny it with those who deny it! The unfortunate man must be ready to serve "under two flags," and adopt a system of rubrical Vicar-of-Brayism for the benefit of his disunited congregation. He can imitate "Catholic Antiquity" and Dr. King, the Bishop of Lincoln, for three Sundays, provided that he will play Cranmer and Dr. Ryle, the Bishop of Liverpool, on the fourth!

It would be puerile to plead, as the Archbishop pleaded, that the ceremonies have no doctrinal significance. His own people, and his fellow-Bishops have been much too straightforward to adopt for a moment such a plea.¹ Even *The Times* in a leading article dismissed it as unreal.

No one will doubt for a moment the honesty and sincerity of the Archbishop. Yet to our minds such a direction as that which he has given, to celebrate High for the High, and Low for the Low, could have but one meaning. It reads to us as a direct sanction of liturgical double-dealing. It is worse. It is the principle of double-dealing which implies, in many cases, the crushing of conscience. It is worse. It is double-dealing in the sanctuary and applied to the most Sacred, Solemn and Central Act of Religion. Heresy, indeed, with its inherent inconsistencies, throws all things hopelessly out of gear, and puts honest and honourable men into positions of crucial difficulty. But who could have foretold that such a direction for double-dealing in the ministry could have gone forth in the name of religion from the chief Anglican Bishop in truth-loving England!

It is, perhaps, unfair to attempt an insight into the meaning of the proceedings, by projecting the case by an effort of imagination into our own Communion. Very real points of analogies, of course, are wanting. But sufficient remain to enable Catholic readers to realise it in some measure for themselves.

¹The Secretary of the Church Association promptly declared that "the feeling that the Archbishop can make the Adoration of the Host harmless by saying that the rites which express it mean nothing at all, can hardly be sustained. He might as well pronounce that ice does not freeze, nor fire burn." The Anglican Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol most sensibly pointed out in a pastoral: "*It is impossible to deny that there are usages and ceremonies which are intimately connected with doctrine, and are tenaciously maintained, and just as tenaciously opposed, because both parties know that doctrine is the moving principle. Such usages will never be disposed of by the declaration that they are to be understood to have no doctrinal significance. Neither party will admit this, and controversy will continue with even increased asperity. In attempting to lay down limits of ritual, limits of doctrine will commonly have, in some form or other, to be regarded as a part of the problem, and it is idle to think it can be otherwise*" (Pastoral, *Guardian*, 14th Jan., 1891).

Let us suppose for a moment that a portion of our people have come to disbelieve in transubstantiation. Imagine an order thereupon being issued to our clergy commanding them to celebrate the Mass as usual for those who believe in it, but, once a month, for the benefit of the non-believers, to say Mass without lights, or vestments, and enjoining them to be careful not to genuflect to the Blessed Sacrament! There are more than a quarter of a million of priests in the Catholic Church. One may fairly doubt if, in the vast array, there is even one who would not consider such an invitation as an insult to his manhood and his conscience.

CHAPTER XIII.

Archbishop Benson on the "Italian Mission".

(10TH JANUARY, 1891.)

THE Archbishop, Dr. Benson, in his Pastoral of January, 1891, devoted a special paragraph to "the Church of Rome". It is a "digression," he says, which he "felt bound to make". This digression is short, but pregnant with the many things which the Archbishop has to say. First of all, he assures his clergy that he is not afraid of us.

I feel that to say so much as this gives to those who are uneasy the right to ask men if I do not fear that men are in danger of being led to the Church of Rome. I answer, I do not.

He ascribes the existence of such fears to the recollection of the mischief wrought by us when Rome was dominant in this land.

Considering how much wrong Christianity and this country suffered during the Roman domination, I do not wonder that fears arise.

Whereupon he gives three reasons why he considers that such fears are groundless. These reasons are sufficiently simple. First, the Church Service is in English. Secondly, it is largely made up of Scripture. Thirdly, the clergy are married men. (If there is anti-climax in the arrangement, the Archbishop is responsible.)

But I do not think this will lead to Rome. With my predecessor, I believe that, while our service is in this mother-tongue of ours, and is the glory of it, and Scripture makes so large a part of it, and inspires the whole, and is in every home and every hand, and the clergy are citizens and fathers of families, there will be no following for Rome.

Anticipating the objection that these reasons, however good, have not, after all, prevented such a following in the past, he holds that the progress of the Catholic Church in England is much more of the brick-and-mortar kind than in the shape of spiritual conquest.

It has been shown that in all these years she has effected here a multiplication of edifices and institutions, but not of souls; that she makes no statistical progress.

Finally, he claims that the "Ancient Church of England" is with him (the Church of Augustine, Theodore, Dunstan, Anselm and Becket?). He calls the Catholic Church of this country the "New Italian Mission," and holds that it will not succeed in making converts from his clergy or people.

No. The Ancient Church of England is with us. I do not fear that the new Italian Mission will make anything of our clergy or people. This is a digression I feel bound to make.

Thus the Archbishop began his digression with three reasons and he ends it with three statements. The reasons speak for themselves. We review the statements in inverse order.

He says that there is no reason to fear that we shall make anything of his clergy or people. That depends very largely upon the facts. We can only judge the facts of the future by those of the past and the present. Whether these furnish any security for the Archbishop's fearlessness is surely somewhat open to question.

It is said that from the beginning of the Tractarian Movement until now Rome has won over to her fold more than 500 of the Anglican clergy, and, during that period, a very much larger number of the laity of all ranks and classes. That, for the interval given may, or may not be, a large capture. Yet it would be difficult to single out any other

instance in Christendom where one religious body has, apart from political motives, taken over so much from any one other religious body, and, that in the face of such odds, inside the same space of time. Had the Church in France, Spain or Italy—or even the schismatic Church in Russia—had to suffer a transference of its subjects in anything like the same proportions, it may be doubted whether the spiritual authorities would have had the calmness and courage to treat it as nothing, or regard the seductive causes as something from which they had nothing to fear. If Dr. Benson is satisfied from his side, we, from ours, are not disposed to complain. We only feel that Anglicanism rules off its losses very pleasantly—more pleasantly than most people can find heart to do when the balance is paid in souls.

Then, apart from our progress as reckoned by the enumeration of converts, there is the progress of our doctrines—the blessed penumbra which the light of faith within the Church casts into a wide circle of souls outside our pale. It is a phase of progress which is of national import, and one of which the influence is far too wide and too subtle to be tangible to any process of statistical measurement.

The doctrines of the Mass, Confession, Invocation of our Lady and of the Saints, Purgatory, Prayers for the Dead, Monasticism, have all been deftly working and winning their way into the conscience of a large section of the English people. They are giving colour and shape to the religious life, thought and worship of the nation.

A hundred years ago, and the Establishment employed all its strength to denounce and refute these very articles of Catholic faith. Now it lends us some three or four thousand pulpits to have them preached. We know—for “our fathers have narrated it unto us”—what was the teaching, belief, worship of the English Church on all the above-named tenets during the Stuart, Caroline and Georgian eras. The Archbishop can see for himself what it is now. At the beginning of the nineteenth century, dense walls of dogmatic prejudice and hostility on all these points blocked our path. Now, at the end of it, there is not one of these walls—these bastions of the Reformation Jericho—which is

not breached from within and from without, and a stream of men is ever pouring through to us.

If the Archbishop be the acute observer of the age which a man in his position can hardly fail to be, these facts cannot be silent in his ears. Taking the whole body of Anglican religious belief, he must know that the doctrinal centre of gravity has changed. He must know that the change is significantly great. He must know that the change has been Romeward. In the face of such facts, can he believe, or ask practical Englishmen to believe, that there is nothing to fear from the side of Rome? A life-movement like the above is not likely to stop short at the end of the present century. Were an astronomer of religious bodies to take his stand and observe the whole of the phenomena from a neighbouring planet, he would lay down his telescope with a clearly formed conviction. The English Church, he would tell us, is gradually moving under and into the influence of a larger body. The curve of doctrinal deflection and the ratio of attraction are becoming more and more marked. In the laws of religious, as of physical, attraction, the attracted body moves not less but more rapidly the nearer it approaches the body to which it is attracted.

"Movement there is," the Anglican will exclaim, "but it is towards that which is Catholic, and not to that which is Roman"! Good; but we believe it is to both. Those who are outside a circle can hardly draw nearer to it without drawing nearer to its centre. Every Catholic truth tends to Rome by its own weight. Only let the movement go forward, and we are quite willing to trust to grace and the inherent logical unity of truth for the sequel.

CHAPTER XIV.

Are we an "Italian Mission"?

WITH a sudden descent to the level of mere Littledaleism, Archbishop Benson has allowed himself to speak of us as the "New Italian Mission".

The Church of which we are the members includes the

bulk of Christendom. She evangelised this island when its name of England had not yet passed over human lips. During the course of her history many weapons have been tried against her. The most pitiful and the most hopeless of all would be that of name-calling.

But the Archbishop in calling us an "Italian Mission" may have felt there is a sense in which the expression can be conceived as appropriate. It is undoubtedly true that we hold our jurisdiction by our communion with the Apostolic See of Rome. In common with the rest of the Catholic Church, we are subject to it. (The expression is not ours. Pope St. Gregory the Great said that he did not know any Church which was not subject to it.¹) We stand to it in the relation of "members to a head". (The expression is not ours. It was used by the Fathers of the Council of Chalcedon in 451, addressing Pope Leo, and submitting to him their decrees "for confirmation and assent"—Mansi, *Concil. Collectio*, tom. vii., c. 147, 156.)

On the other hand, it is just as true that Rome is in Italy. If these two conditions suffice to constitute an "Italian Mission," they are abundantly verified. But in that case "Italian Missions" are about as old as Christianity. It is a fairly long time since Irenæus in the second century singled out the Apostolic See as the centre with which "all churches must agree". It is longer still since Rome began to be in Italy.

Perhaps the most noteworthy instance of an "Italian Mission" in this sense was that of St. Augustine and his fellow-monks who came here from Rome and founded the English Church and the Primatial See of Canterbury. That was an Italian Mission *par excellence*. It was precisely owing to its being so successful that the Archbishop enjoys by the law of the land his rank and title, and is able to sit in judgment on the Bishop of Lincoln, and to write the

¹ St. Gregory, speaking of the Church of Constantinople, says: "Whoever doubts that it is subject to the Apostolic See? That is constantly avowed by the most pious Emperor and by our brother Eusebius, the bishop of that city." Speaking of an African bishop St. Gregory says: "As to what he says, that he is subject to the Apostolic See, if fault is found in bishops, I do not know any bishop who is not subject to the Apostolic See" (*Letters of St. Gregory*, lib. vii., 64 and 65).

Pastoral which speaks of the origin of his Bishopric so disparagingly.

In every other sense the Archbishop's epithet is all that is illogical. Our union with the Apostolic See connects us with the *See* of Rome. It does not connect us with *Italy* any more than it connects us with Spain or Portugal. According to the practice of Christian antiquity Sees are named from cities, not from tracts of country. Bishoprics which are styled “Southern Europe,” “Queensland,” “New Jersey” or “Ohio,” strike a jarring note of modernity and incongruity into the ears of all students of Church history. Thence, we are Roman—not Italian. We are “Roman” in the sense that we have the Bishop of the Roman See for our spiritual head. But we are no more Italian than we are French, or German, or American, or Christian Chinese. Italy is the name of a nation. We are Catholics. Our Church is the mother of the nations, but she wears the badge of none. She could never be dwarfed or degraded into a mere National Church. As Catholic, she is the Church of “all nations,” and in her beloved fold all frontiers of nationhood disappear and lose their significance. The Spouse of Christ cannot be draped in the Italian tricolor any more than she could be rolled up in the Union Jack.

CHAPTER XV.

With Whom is “The Ancient Church of England”?

THE Archbishop claims that the “Ancient Church of England is with him”. To us the whole history of the Ancient Church of England says just the reverse. The Archbishop's entire position—his *raison d'être*—since the Reformation, is based upon the principle that the “Bishop of Rome has no jurisdiction in this realm of England”. Our whole position is based upon the opposite principle, that the Bishop of Rome, as successor of St. Peter, has jurisdiction over the whole flock of Christ, and, therefore, in England and every other part of the Christian world. The Church history of this land is with us, and proves to us with overwhelming and irresistible evidence that from the

very foundation of the English Church Papal jurisdiction was both exercised and recognised in this country.

Here, for instance, are ten main facts :—

1. **Foundation.**—St. Augustine and his fellow-monks, who first preached the Gospel to the English people and laid the earliest foundations of the English Church, were sent and commissioned from Rome by Pope St. Gregory the Great. They came “in obedience to the Pope’s commands” (Bede, *Hist. Ecc.*, i., 23). The Pope gave to St. Augustine “authority” to found the two metropolitan sees and the suffragan bishoprics (*ibid.*, i., 29). The English Church was thus born in an act of Papal jurisdiction. This could not be explained away as a mere missionary expansion by which St. Augustine was sent to form and found a Church, which once established was to be autonomous or independent. The very Pope in question, St. Gregory, held that he was successor of St. Peter, and that St. Peter received from Christ the “charge of the *whole* Church”.¹ Hence, despite his disclaimer of the title of “universal bishop” in its exclusive and unorthodox sense, St. Gregory undoubtedly taught and acted upon the doctrine of Papal jurisdiction, and we have his own words affirming that all Churches, even that of Constantinople itself, are “subject to the Apostolic See” (*Letters*, 46; vii., 64, 65). An English Church independent of the jurisdiction of the Apostolic See could not have entered into the mind of either St. Gregory or St. Augustine. The English Church itself evidently accepted St. Gregory’s authority as universal, as Venerable Bede, writing nearly two centuries later, says that the “Blessed Pope Gregory . . . bore the pontifical power over all the world” (*Ecc. Hist.*, Book II., chap. i., transl. Giles, p. 62).²

2. **The Pallium.**—St. Augustine and his successors in the See of Canterbury for nearly a thousand years either

¹ “To all who read the gospel, it is plain that by the voice of the Lord the charge of the whole Church (*cura totius ecclesiae*) was given to the holy Prince of all the Apostles, St. Peter” (*Letters*, xxxii., Book IV.; Mansi, *Collect. Conc.*, ix., 1207).

² That St. Gregory taught that he as the successor of St. Peter had a primacy not merely of honour but of authority over the *whole* Church is fully admitted by the most recent Anglican writer on the subject, the Rev. F. Dudden, B.D., Fellow of Lincoln College, Oxford, in his *Gregory the Great*, vol. ii., pp. 224 and 411.

went or sent to Rome to ask for the Pallium, the Y-shaped stole, which was laid on the tomb of St. Peter. The investiture with the Pallium by the Pope conveyed the fulness of the Archiepiscopal authority and certain powers of metropolitan jurisdiction enabling the receiver to consecrate suffragan bishops.

Thus Pope Honorius, writing to Honorius, Archbishop of Canterbury, in 634, says: “Wherefore, according to your request, and to that of the Kings our sons, we do by our present order, acting in the place of Blessed Peter, Prince of the Apostles, grant you authority that when either of you is called by the Divine Grace to Himself, he that survives shall ordain a bishop in the place of the deceased. *For which purpose* we have sent Palls to each of you, for the celebration of the said ordination, so that by *the authority of our command*, you may make an ordination pleasing to God” (Bede, *Hist. Ecc.*, ii., 18). In the grant to Dunstan the Pope sends the Pallium to enable him to act as the “Vicar” of the Apostolic See (*vices agere*)—(Labbe, *Councils*, ix., 643).

The notion that the Roman Pallium given to the English Archbishops was merely an honorific decoration like the bestowal of the Garter, is absolutely inconsistent with the terms of the letters which accompanied the grant, as well as with the well-known facts of English history. Kemble, a non-Catholic writer upon the Anglo-Saxon period, speaking of the Pallium, shows by a number of texts that it was given and accepted as “conveying powers which without it could not be exercised”. To those who urge that the gift was an act of Papal usurpation, he very aptly replies: “The question is not whether the Roman See had the right to make the demand, but—whether usurpation or not—it was acquiesced in and accepted by the Anglo-Saxon Church; and on that point there can be no dispute” (Kemble’s *Anglo-Saxons in Britain*, vol. ii., p. 370, note). So great was the importance which the Archbishops of the English Church attached to the Pallium, that they usually made the whole journey of nearly 1,000 miles to the Roman Court to receive it; or, if they were invested with it here in England, it was their custom, out of reverence, to walk barefooted in solemn procession to meet the Roman envoy who brought

it, and to prostrate themselves on the ground before receiving it (Maskell's *Monumenta*, ii., 316). Archbishop Courtenay, although present at a consecration of bishops, would not presume to lay on hands "because he had not yet received the Pallium" (*Anglia Sacra*, i., 121). Thus, from St. Augustine to Cranmer, during the long line of some ten centuries of English history, the Primate of the English Church in all great functions stood arrayed with the Pallium as the visible symbol of the Papal origin of their jurisdiction.

3. **Archbishop Theodore.**—In the year 664 Deusdedit, the Archbishop of Canterbury, died. The two English kings, Egbert of Kent and Oswy of Northumbria, sent a priest named Wighard to Rome, with a request that he might be made Archbishop. Wighard died at Rome. Thereupon, Pope Vitalian chose a monk called Theodore, and appointed and consecrated him to the See of Canterbury. On arriving in England, Theodore made a visitation of the various dioceses, and so thoroughly organised the English Church that the main diocesan and parochial framework which it preserved up to the Reformation is in large measure attributed to his ability. In 673 he held a Council at Hertford, and in the Acts of this Council Theodore declares himself appointed by the Pope. "I, Theodore, unworthy bishop of the See of Canterbury, appointed by the Apostolic See." It was thus to a bishop, chosen, consecrated and commissioned by the Pope that the early Church of this country owed mainly its consolidation and organisation and the first framing of that diocesan and parochial fabric which it maintained substantially for nearly a thousand years of its history. The English Church was thus not only founded, but moulded and shaped by bishops appointed by the Apostolic See.

4. **St. Wilfrid.**—About the year 679 Theodore, considering that the diocese of York was too large, divided it into several parts. St. Wilfrid, the Archbishop of York, aggrieved at the division, appealed to Rome. The Pope confirmed the partition of the diocese, but decreed that Wilfrid himself

should be allowed to make it, and select the new bishops. When St. Wilfrid returned and produced the Papal letter to this effect, King Egfrid of Northumbria, and certain bishops assembled with him, refused to accept it, and alleged that it had been obtained by bribery. They cast St. Wilfrid into prison for nine months. On his release, St. Wilfrid went to Rome and obtained from the Pope a fresh mandate in his favour. Returning to England, he showed the mandate to Archbishop Theodore, who, as Wilfrid's companion and biographer, Eddius, tells us (Gale, p. 73), “honouring with fear the authority of the Apostolic See, by which he himself had been sent,” at once expressed great sorrow for having treated St. Wilfrid unjustly, and wrote to King Aldfrith in his favour. In obedience to the Papal judgment St. Wilfrid had the dioceses of Hexham and Lindisfarne, and finally those of Ripon and York restored to him. Thus the Papal judgment was fully enforced.

Soon after the death of Theodore, St. Wilfrid had a dispute about Church lands with the Primate, Berthwald, and the neighbouring bishops. Again he appealed to Rome. Pope John VI. heard the case and decided in his favour. The Primate received the Papal decision, and urged the Kings to accept it. King Ethelred of Mercia received it with all obedience. King Alchfrid of Northumbria at first refused to obey, but soon after, on his death-bed, repented and ordered that “his heir should fulfil the Apostolic judgment”. The Primate assembled a Synod at Nidd and read the Papal letters. These, the Primate explained, required one of two things—either that peace should be made with Wilfrid and his lands restored to him, or that all concerned should proceed to Rome to have the whole case tried by the Holy See. If any one refused to accept these alternatives, “he must understand, whether he be King or layman, that he is excommunicated, and that if he be bishop or priest, that he is stripped of all rank of ecclesiastical dignity” (Eddius, lviii.). When some of the bishops protested that this meant the alteration of what had been agreed upon at Osterfield “between Theodore, who was sent by the Apostolic See, and King Egfrith,” the Abbess Ethelfleda bore witness to the King's repentance and to

his dying wish that "all the judgments of the Apostolic See concerning St. Wilfrid should be fulfilled," and to his charge to his successor to that effect. Thereupon, Berechfrith, the King's representative, said: "This is the will of the King and his princes that to the commands of the Apostolic See, and to the instructions of King Alchfrid we should render obedience in all things" (Eddius, lviii.). Peace was accordingly made, as the Papal mandate had enjoined.

St. Wilfrid, now advanced in years, was willing to be content with the bishoprics of Hexham and Ripon, which were accordingly restored to him. Such is the final and decisive act in the case of St. Wilfrid, as authentically described by a contemporary witness, Eddius, the most ancient of the historical writers of England. It bears witness to the recognition of Papal authority as paramount to mere local or temporal obstruction in the Church of the Anglo-Saxon period.

5. **The Liturgy.**—The Liturgy used here in England was the Roman rite.¹ In the Council of Cloveshoe held in A.D. 747, the bishops of England required that the Church festivals "and in all things pertaining thereto, in the rite of Baptism, the celebration of Masses, in the Church music, shall be kept according to the copy which we have received in writing from the Roman Church. And in like manner, the festivals of the Saints shall be kept on one and the same day according to the martyrology of the said Roman Church, with the psalmody and music thereto appertaining" (Canon 13). They also decreed that in the Church services no one was to presume to read or sing what was not sanctioned by common use, but only "what comes from Holy Scripture, and what is permitted by the custom of the Roman Church" (Canon 15)—(Haddan and Stubbs, *Ecclesiastical Councils*, iii., 367). To secure complete uniformity with Rome, not only books and vestments, but even choir-masters were brought from Rome for the purpose (Bede, *Ecc. His.*, iv., 17, 18).

¹ Sarum, York, Hereford, etc., were not distinct *rites* but merely various "uses" of one and the same Roman rite, with slight modifications borrowed from other Western sources.

In the Canon of every Mass said in England from the earliest times¹ the Pope was publicly prayed for, and in precedence of the Archbishop and of the King. In the Sarum Missal, used in England before the Reformation, the prayer is for the Catholic Church, "with thy Servant, our Pope N., and our Bishop N., and our King N." In the Missal of Leofric, who was Bishop of Crediton in Anglo-Saxon times, it reads: "With thy most Blessed Servant, our Pope N.," etc. Alcuin, the great English scholar of the ninth century, says that they are schismatics or cut off from the communion of the Catholic world, who, on account of dissension, omit the name of the Pope in the Sacred Liturgy. "It is evident that those, who, on account of any disagreement, discontinue the customary commemoration of the Apostolic Pontiff in the Mass, are separated from the communion of the whole world" (*De Divinis Officiis*, c. 10).

Not only in the Sacred Canon of the Mass, but in the Bedes or Bidding prayers which on Sundays and greater festivals in all the cathedrals and parish churches of England were said in the vernacular before or during Mass, and were responded to by the people, the Pope was publicly prayed for. "And therefore, after a laudable consuetude, and a lawful custome of our Mother Holy Churche, ye shal knele down praying your speciale prayers for the iii estates, concernyng all Christen people: that is to saye, for the Spiritualltye, the Temporaltie, and the soules being in the paynes of Purgatorye. Fyrst, for our holy Father the Pope, with all hys Cardinalls, for all Archbysshops and byshops, and in especiall for my lord Archbishop of Canterburye, your Metropolitaine," etc. "Secondly, ye shal pray for the unitie and peace of al Christen Realmes, and specially for the noble Realm of England, for our sovereign lord the King, for the Prince," etc. (from the *English Festival*, quoted in *Rock's Church of the Fathers*, ii., 366). The form used in Anglo-Saxon times prayed for "our Pope in

¹The practice of praying for the Pope in the Canon of the Mass was already established long before the conversion of England. The Council of Vaisson in A.D. 529 decreed: "It has seemed right to us that the name of the lord Pope, whoever presides over the Apostolic See, shall be recited in our Churches" (Canon 4)—(Mansi, viii., 725).

Rome, and for our King, and for our Archbishop"—“Thittan we gebiddan for urne Papan on Rome, and for urne Cyning, and for ne Arceb.” (*Church of the Fathers*, ii., 355). Thus, in every Mass, and in every cathedral and parish church in the land, generations of English men and women from age to age heard every Sunday of their lives the recognition of the Pope as their spiritual head, both in the Liturgy and in the popular “Bidding of the Bedes”.

6. **Peter's Pence.**—The offering of Peter's Pence, or a sum of money yearly sent to the Pope, was commanded by English law in the Anglo-Saxon period, and was made obligatory in the same manner as the ordinary tithe. In the laws of King Eadmund is the decree, “Tithe we enjoin on every Christian man on his Christendom, and church-shot and Rome fee” (Thorpe, i., 244). In like manner in the laws of Canute it is decreed: “And let God's dues be willingly paid every year . . . and Rome Fee by St. Peter's Mass” (Kemble, ii., 547).

7. **Legatine Councils in Anglo-Saxon Times.**—As far back as the eighth century the Pope sent Legates to this country to convey the Apostolic commands, to correct abuses, and to report on the state of the Church.

Thus, about the year 787, Pope Adrian I. sent two Legates called George and Theophylact. The report which the first of these Legates made to the Pope upon what they had seen and done is still extant, and it furnishes an authentic testimony as to the attitude of the English Church of that time to the Holy See. The report describes how the Legates arrived at Canterbury and were received by the Archbishop, and how, during their stay, they “gave admonition where necessary”. It continues: “Journeying thence we came to the palace of Offa, King of the Mercians, and he, on account of the reverence due to Blessed Peter, and the honour due to your Apostleship, received with exceeding great joy both ourselves and the sacred Letters which we had brought from the Supreme See. Then Offa, King of the Mercians, and Kynewulf, King of the West-Saxons, called together a Council. We delivered to it your

sacred writing, and they forthwith promised that they would correct themselves from their faults.”

A Council was then held at York, and the King of Northumbria and Archbishop Eanbald were present. The Legate, after describing the assembly of the Council and the need of correcting existing abuses, continues his report to the Pope: “We have drawn up a list of headings of the several things, and have arranged them in order, and have read them over in their hearing, and they with all subjection of humility, and with evident readiness, received your admonition as well as our own, and they promised in all things to obey the same. Then we gave them your letters to read, charging both themselves and their subjects to observe your sacred decrees.”

The first heading or chapter in this Council contains the following: “We admonish . . . the bishops of the several Churches that in their yearly synods they examine diligently concerning the said Faith the priests who are to teach the people, so that they shall in all things hold and profess and preach the Apostolic Faith and Catholic Faith of the Six Councils attested by the Holy Spirit, as the Holy Roman Church has delivered it unto us, and that if need be, shall not fear to lay down their lives for the same” (chap. i.).

Another chapter requires that bishops and prelates shall be models to their subjects, and adds: “And for this purpose we recommend that the synodal edicts of the Six General Councils, with the Decrees of the Roman Pontiff be frequently read, and observed, and that the state of the Church be corrected according to their standard, lest anything new be suffered to be introduced by any one, and schism to arise in the Church of God” (chap. iv.).

The close of the Council is described by the Legate in the following words: “We have put forward these decrees, most blessed Pope Adrian, in the public council before King Aélfwald and the Archbishop Eanbald, and all the bishops and abbots of the country, with the senators and leaders, and the people of the land. And they, as we have said above, with all devotedness of soul, vowed to observe them in all things to the uttermost of their strength with the help of God’s mercy. And they have signed it by the sign of

Holy Cross in our hand, as taking your place, and then with earnest pen have imprinted the same on this page, marking it with the sign of the Cross." (Then follow the solemn signatures of the king, bishops, nobles, etc.)

The Legates then held a Council in Mercia, at which King Offa and Icenbert, Archbishop of Canterbury, and the rest of the bishops of the country were assembled. The chapters agreed upon at York were each read in Latin and in Anglo-Saxon. The same cordial acceptance of the decrees and the Papal admonitions followed. "With one voice, and with eager mind, they all gave thanks, and promised to keep the admonitions of your Apostleship in all these statutes, by God's assistance to the best of their strength and with all their hearts" (Report of the Legates in Haddan and Stubbs' *Ecclesiastical Councils*, iii., 447-460).

8. The Making and Unmaking of an Archbishopric.—About this time (A.D. 787) Offa, King of Mercia, desired that the dioceses which lay within his dominions should form a distinct ecclesiastical province, separate from York and Canterbury, and that the See of Lichfield should be raised to the rank of an Archbishopric. He petitioned Pope Adrian and sent an embassy to Rome to obtain the authorisation for the proposed changes. The Pope granted the petition, separated five dioceses from the jurisdiction of the Archbishop of Canterbury, erected Lichfield into an Archbishopric, bestowed the Pallium upon Higbert, as the new Archbishop, and gave him jurisdiction over the five suffragan sees, which composed the new ecclesiastical province.¹

Later on the new arrangement was found to be unsatisfactory, and in A.D. 801 King Kenulph, the successor of Offa, sent an embassy to Rome, and petitioned Pope Leo, in the name of his kingdom, to restore the division of the

¹ According to the historian of Offa, these changes were carried out at the Council of Calchuth held by the Papal Legates (Wilkins' *Concilia*, i., 152). On the other hand, the Legates' report to the Pope does not mention them. What is certain is that the authorisation for the creation of the Archbishopric, the bestowal of the Pallium, and the transference of the five sees from the jurisdiction of Canterbury, were all authoritative acts of the Pope. This is clear from the letter of Pope Leo to King Kenulph.

country into its two original provinces, and to give back to Canterbury its former precedence and jurisdiction. His letter reveals to us more clearly and authentically than anything else could the spiritual relation and attitude of an Anglo-Saxon King to the Papacy. It is as follows:—

“To the most holy and most loving lord, Leo, Pontiff of the Sacred and Apostolic See of Rome, Kenulph, by the grace of God King of the Mercians, with the bishops, princes, and every degree of dignity under our authority, sendeth greeting in the sincere love of Christ.

“We give thanks to God at all times, Who amidst the tempests of this life is wont to guide the Church which He bought with His precious blood, to the haven of salvation, and to illumine her with fresh light, by means of new leaders, when the former have been taken to their reward, so that thus she is obscured by no darkness of error, but treads the way of truth without stumbling.¹ Hence, with good reason, does the Church, throughout the whole world, rejoice that the true Recompenser of all good has taken up to Heaven for his everlasting reward, Adrian, the most glorious Pastor of His Flock, while nevertheless His tender Providence has provided for His sheep a leader who knows how to conduct the Lord’s Flock to the fold of life not less high. And we, who live at the farthest corner of the earth, in like manner, rightly glory beyond all others, that his exaltation is our salvation, and his prosperity our perpetual joy, for whence you derive your Apostolical dignity, thence we derived the knowledge of the true Faith.”

¹ To say that the Church is so guided and illumined in this succession of its leaders as to be obscured by no darkness of error and to tread the path of truth without stumbling is, for its time and place, a very fair statement of Church Infallibility and, we might say, of Papal Infallibility, since it is to the Papal Succession—the death of Adrian and the accession of Leo—that the King is obviously referring. In 1412 the English Church is more definite on the point. The Archbishop of Canterbury and the bishops of the Province, after affirming the Divine institution of the Papacy, say plainly: “For this is that most blessed See, which by God’s Almighty grace, is known never to have erred from the path of Apostolic tradition, and has never been stained or overcome by heretical novelty; and to it, as the Mother and Mistress of all other Churches, the excellent authority of the holy Fathers ordained that all matters, and chiefly those relating to Faith, should be referred for decision and sentence” (Letter of Archbishop Arundel and Suffragans, Wilkins’ *Concilia*, iii., 350).

The King then makes the following profession of his Catholic obedience:—

“Wherefore, I deem it right to render humble obedience to your holy commands, and to fulfil with my whole strength whatever your Holiness will consider it right for us to do, and if anything shall appear to you to be opposed to right, to avoid it forthwith, and to have no part therein.

“And now, I Kenulph, by God’s grace King, humbly implore your Excellency, that I may as I wish, without any offence, be allowed to address you upon our progress, so that you may with peace receive me into the bosom of your affection. And thus may your bountiful blessing qualify me, who have but little merit of my own, for the work of the ruling of my people, so that I and my people, whom your Apostolical authority instructed in the elements of the Faith,¹ may be, through your prayers, defended by the Almighty against the attacks of adversaries, and our Kingdom, which by God was given, may by God be extended.

“This blessing which all the Kings who have held the sceptre in Mercia, have merited to receive from your predecessors; this I myself humbly beg; and this from your Holiness I desire to obtain; that you would above all accept me as your adopted son, even as I love you as a father, and ever embrace you with all the strength of my obedience.”

The King then states the dissatisfaction which has been caused by the new arrangement of these provinces, brought about by King Offa and the late Pope, and the desire to revert to the original plan, and to restore to Canterbury its former precedence and jurisdiction. He concludes in these terms:—

“We do not blame either of these persons, whom, we believe, Christ has rewarded with eternal life. But nevertheless, we humbly beseech your Excellency, to whom the Keys of Wisdom have been worthily given by God, that you

¹Certain writers have claimed that evangelisation of the northern and midland parts of England is to be credited not to Roman missionaries but rather to the Celtic missionaries from Iona. The co-operation of the Celtic missionaries and their recuperation of a large section of England is a well-known fact, but it is clear from the above that the tradition of Mercia itself, as far back as the eighth century, ascribed its conversion to the Apostolic See.

would examine the case with your counsellors, and that you will deign to write back to us whatsoever it will seem right to you that we should observe in the future, so that the seamless coat of Christ may not suffer any rent by dissensions amongst us, and that by your sound doctrine, we may, as we desire, be directed into the unity of true peace.

“With great humility, and at the same time with great affection, we have written these things to you, O most blessed Pope, earnestly entreating your clemency, that you will return a just and favourable answer to those things which were of necessity submitted to you.”

The King then commends to the Pope his envoys who are charged with his gifts, and concludes in that formula which became a tradition in the English chancery: “May God Almighty long preserve you in His keeping, to the glory of His Holy Church”.

The Pope replied to King Kenulph, “to the most excellent prince, my son,” and promised to grant his petition. Accordingly, on 18th January, 802, he addressed an Apostolic brief to Ethelheard, Archbishop of Canterbury, in which, by Apostolic authority, he restored the full primacy and precedence to the See of Canterbury, and reduced the number of ecclesiastical provinces to the original two, as had been ordained by Pope Gregory the Great. The Pope’s sentence in this brief is as follows:—

“Wherefore, by the authority of Blessed Peter, Prince of the Apostles, to whom by the Lord God was given the power of binding and of loosing, when it was said, ‘Thou art Peter, and upon this Rock I will build my Church, and the gates of Hell shall not prevail against it, and to thee will I give the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt bind upon earth it shall be bound in Heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt loose upon earth, it shall be loosed in Heaven,’ even so, according to the judgment of the sacred Canons, We, however unworthy, holding the place of the same Blessed Peter, the Key-bearer of the Heavenly Kingdom, grant to thee, Ethelheard, and to thy successors, to hold by inviolable right for ever in thy Metropolitan See, all the churches of England, as it was in times past, subject

to your jurisdiction. But if any one—which we trust shall not come to pass—shall attempt to contravene this the authority of our sentence and Apostolic charter, by Apostolic authority we decree that whether he be archbishop or bishop, he shall be deposed from his bishopric. In like manner, if he be priest or deacon, or in any other grade of the sacred ministry, he shall be deposed. If he be one of the laity, let him be King or Prince, great person or small, he shall be excommunicated. This charter of perpetual privilege We, by the authority of the Blessed Peter, Prince of the Apostles, whose office we exercise, grant to thee, Ethelheard, and to thy successors. For the security of which we have subscribed it with our own hand, and commanded it to be signed with our name" (Haddan and Stubbs' *Councils*, vol. iii., 537).

Such is the Papal Decree by which the Primate of the English Church recovered his control over the Diocese of Lichfield and the other Sees of Mercia. An Archbishopric is necessarily a centre of jurisdiction. Hence to create a new Archbishopric, and to invest it with jurisdiction over a number of suffragan sees withdrawn for that purpose from Canterbury, and in like manner to dismantle the said Archbishopric, to release the suffragan sees from its jurisdiction, and to restore both it and them to the jurisdiction of Canterbury, are evidently and eminently so many acts of high ecclesiastical jurisdiction. These acts of jurisdiction were exercised by the Pope in this realm of England in the very midst of the Anglo-Saxon period, and the authority of the Pope in exercising them is not only fully recognised by the English Church and nation, but is petitioned for and invoked in terms of cordial obedience and submission.

9. Westminster Abbey.—According to the charters of the Abbey, and, therefore, to say the least, according to the most authentic tradition of its foundation, Westminster Abbey was built by King Edward the Confessor in obedience to a judgment of a Pope, and as a mark of the devotion of the English people to the Apostolic See.

The account of its foundation which may be seen in the

charters is as follows: King Edward, while still in exile in Normandy, vowed that if ever he were restored to the throne of his fathers, he would go in pilgrimage to Rome and make his thanksgiving to God at the tomb of the Apostles. When, by God's providence, he was put in possession of the kingdom, he prepared to set out for Rome in fulfilment of his vow. But his counsellors implored him not to leave the realm at a time when his presence was so much needed. The King, bound on the one hand by his vow, and anxious on the other to safeguard his kingdom, agreed to depute a number of bishops and nobles and send them to Rome to lay the whole matter before the Pope, promising to abide by his judgment. The Pope received the embassy, heard the case, and delivered judgment. “By the authority of God, and of the Holy Apostles, and the Sacred Council,” he absolved him from the vow, and added, “We command thee in the name of holy obedience and penance, that you distribute to the poor the money which you had prepared for the expenses of this journey, and that you construct a new or rebuild or enlarge an old monastery in honour of St. Peter, Prince of the Apostles” (Wilkins' *Concilia*, vol. i., 316). The fulfilment of the Papal judgment was the foundation of Westminster Abbey, dedicated to St. Peter. The Abbey, therefore, as far as the traditions of its charters can assure us, stands in our midst as the everlasting monument of an Anglo-Saxon King's devout obedience to the Apostolic See, and of a Pope's Apostolic authority exercised over and cordially recognised by an Anglo-Saxon King.

10. **Testimony of Catholic Belief.**—The records of the Anglo-Saxon people leave us in no doubt as to the Articles of Faith which were believed and taught in the Church of that period. Genuine Reformational Protestantism and Monasticism are two ideas which are antagonistic and mutually incompatible. The one takes its stand on the doctrine of Justification by Faith alone, the other on the value of asceticism and penitential works. Hence Luther very logically ceased to be a monk when he became a Protestant. The dominant feature of the Anglo-Saxon Church was its monasticism. Its great missionaries and bishops

were monastic, monasteries covered the land, and more than six Anglo-Saxon Kings laid aside their crowns to become monks. Hence the religion of the Anglo-Saxon Church was essentially and diametrically opposed to that basal Protestant belief of Justification by Faith only, which one of the Articles of the present Church of England declares to be a most wholesome doctrine. There is thus the difference of a fundamental principle between the religion of the Anglo-Saxon Church and the religion of the Anglican Reformation. In other Articles of Faith a like opposition is evident. The Anglo-Saxon Church believed in the propitiatory Sacrifice of the Mass. St. Bede says: "In celebrating Masses, we immolate anew to God to help our salvation, the Sacred Body and precious Blood of the Lamb, by which we were redeemed" (Homily in *Vigil. Paschae*). They believed in the Real Presence. St. Bede says: "Christ washes us daily from our sins in His own Blood, when the memory of His Blessed Passion is renewed at the Altar, when, by the ineffable hallowing of the Spirit, the creature of bread and wine is transferred into the Sacrament of His Flesh and Blood" (Hom., i., 14). They believed in confession. The ecclesiastical laws, of which the translation into Anglo-Saxon is attributed to Aelfric, require that "a man shall declare to his confessor every sin that he ever committed either in thought, word or deed" (Wilkins, i., 276). They believed in the invocation of the Saints. The Canons under King Edgar say: "When any one wishes to make the confession of his sins . . . let him kneel down humbly before God upon the ground in adoration and shedding of tears: he asks Blessed Mary, with the holy Angels, and Apostles, and Confessors, and Virgins, and all the elect of God, to intercede for him with the Lord" (Thorpe, *Ancient Laws*, ii., 260). They believed in Purgatory and Masses for the dead. Cuthbert, describing the death of St. Bede, says: "He spoke to each in turn, reminding them and entreating them to celebrate Masses and to pray diligently for him". St. Bede himself devotes a chapter of his history to recording a vision of Purgatory as a "place of flames and frost" (*Hist. Ecc.*, v., 12), and another to showing the power of the Mass when offered for a captive (iv., 22). Cuthbert relates that

the relics of the Saints were carried in procession on the day before the death of St. Bede in A.D. 735.

Thus both in the doctrines of Papal jurisdiction and in the other doctrines of Catholic Faith the Anglo-Saxon Church is with us, and just as clearly it is *not* with Dr. Benson and the Church of the Anglican Reformation.

Here are ten other facts :—

1. William the Conqueror was crowned by Papal Legates, and was himself a suitor in a marriage case at the Court of Rome. Hence, he most practically recognised Papal jurisdiction.

2. Papal Legates carried out the reorganisation of the English Church in a number of Councils presided over by them, and summoned by authority of the Roman See (Wilkins, i., 323).

3. Lanfranc caused two English Bishops (one an Archbishop of York) to go to Rome and surrender their pastoral staffs into the hands of the Pope (Eadmer, *Hist. Novell.*, 6-7).

4. The transfer of sees, as in the case of Lincoln and Exeter, was made by the authority of the Pope (Charter of Lincoln Cathedral; Preface of Leofric's Missal).

5. Disputed elections and all *causæ majores* were decided by the Court of Rome (Bishop Stubbs (*Const. Hist.*, iii., 315) admits that between 1215 and 1264 there were no less than thirty of them).

6. The Archbishops and Bishops of England, for centuries before the Reformation, took publicly a solemn oath of allegiance to the Pope. “I will be faithful to Blessed Peter, and to the Holy Roman Church and to our Lord the Pope. . . . The Roman Papacy I will be their helper to maintain against all men. . . . The commands of the Holy See I will observe with my whole strength and cause them to be observed by others. So help me God and these holy Gospels” (Rymer, xiii., 256).

7. The Constitutions drawn up by the Papal Legates, Otho and Othobon, formed part of the Canon Law pleaded in the Ecclesiastical Courts of England (Lyndwood's *Provinciale Constitutiones Legatinae*).

8. By the Canon Law of England a whole class of sins

and censures were reserved to the Holy See, and could only be absolved by the Pope (Lyndwood's *Provinciale*, 314).

9. In 1246 the English Bishops declared to the Pope that England had been "ever specially devoted to the Roman Church," while the English Abbots and Priors protested that the "English Church has many glories," and is "a special member of the Holy Church of Rome".¹ In the previous year the nobles and Parliament of England while complaining of the excesses of curial exactions, assured the Pope "Our Mother, the Church of Rome, we love with all our hearts, as our duty is . . . to whom we ought always to fly for refuge".² English Kings again and again declared their obedience to the Papacy and their belief that it was instituted by Christ.

10. For nearly two centuries before the Reformation the vast majority of Bishops were appointed by Papal provision, namely, by the direct authority of the Pope, and by Papal Bulls issued to that effect (see Le Neve's *Fasti*).

It would be easier for Dr. Benson to lift Great Britain out of the ocean than to remove these facts from the structure and fibre of English history. And it would be easier for him to turn the island round until the Orkneys faced Calais, and Dover looked into the Arctic, than to give to these facts any other direction or significance than their plain historical meaning, that the ancient Church of England was one that held, and not one that denied that "the Pope hath jurisdiction over this realm of England".

CHAPTER XVI.

A Popular Statement of Anglican Continuity.

(17TH JANUARY, 1891.)

A LETTER published in *The Times* in January, 1891, puts in a plea for the continuity theory of the Church of England. It does so mainly by stating a number of reasons why

¹ Matthew Paris, *Chronica Majora* (Roll Series), vol. iv., p. 531.

² *Ibid.*, p. 441.

English Roman Catholics are to be regarded as an "Italian Mission," and why they cannot be considered as being one with the ancient Church of England.

These reasons are seven :—

1. Because "their Church (the Church of the English Roman Catholics) is presided over by the hierarchy established by Pius IX. forty years ago".

2. Because "till then they were the old Roman Catholic Nonconformists of the country, descendants of those who seceded from the Church of England in 1570, in compliance with the Bull fulminated by Pius V."

3. Because if they were the same as the Ancient Church they would adopt the saying of Gregory the Great, "Whoever calls himself Universal Bishop is the precursor of Antichrist".

4. Because if they were the Ancient Church they would "allow the cup to the laity which they partook of in England until 1283".

5. And would allow "marriage to the clergy which was not absolutely prohibited until the eleventh century".

6. And would leave "Transubstantiation to be an open question, as it remained until the close of the twelfth century".

7. And would "surrender the dogmas of the Immaculate Conception decreed in 1854, and Papal Infallibility decreed in 1870".

A glance at these reasons will show that they fall into sets. In the first we may bracket the opening two; in the second, the remaining five. The first set attacks our organic, and the second our doctrinal continuity. Let us give each a fair chance, and allow full play to the force of each argument.

To begin with, we may note that if the reasons 4, 5 and 6 possessed any force whatever, they would only prove that the breach of continuity lies, not between us and the Pre-Reformation Church, but between the Pre-Reformation Church and the English Church of some antecedent period. If giving communion in one kind, the observance of clerical celibacy, or teaching the doctrine of transubstantiation are

enough to constitute a breach of continuity with a Church which did not hold by these observances, every one knows that all these practices and teaching were authoritatively sanctioned by the English Church during centuries which preceded the Reformation. Then it is quite clear that the English Church for many centuries before the Reformation is in continuity with us, who do all these things, and not with the present Anglican Church, which repudiates them. In that case, the writer has gone out of his way to prove that the breach of continuity is to be found not with us but in Anglicanism, and that a gap of several centuries—to say the least—yawns between the Ancient Church of England and the Anglican Church established at the Reformation. Would he then restore us the property which belonged to the Church of that intervening period?

What is this continuity of ours which the writer is assailing? Nothing more simple.

In the Catholic Church we are bound together in one belief and one body. By this unity we are one with one another all the world over. We are the one flock of Christ, holding the one faith, sharing in the same worship and under the one pastorate of the successor of St. Peter, to whom our Lord committed the chief shepherdship.

We are united in more ways than one. When we take up the Angel's golden rod to measure the matchless symmetry of the city of God, instead of laying it flat over the surface of the world, we may point it downward through the course of the centuries.

When our unity is thus revealed, not in space, but in time—not in place, but in period—we call it continuous oneness or *continuity*.

Catholics in one age are in continuity with Catholics in every preceding age.

And for two reasons. They hold the same belief and offer the same worship. They are subject to the same chief pastoral authority. By the first, they are one and the same faith. By the second, they are one and the same body or society. The first is *doctrinal* and *liturgical*, and the second is *organic* continuity.

Such is the position. Now for the seven arguments against it.

In the organic set, the whole attack seems to us based upon a misapprehension. We Catholics of England are not, never have been, and as Catholics never could be, a mere local Church complete within ourselves. The writer has taken us for one. That will be made clear by an hypothesis. Let us suppose that he were right, and that we English Catholics formed a distinct Church of our own, and that our organism was terminated and completed by our local hierarchy. Let us further suppose that from certain causes that hierarchy collapsed or was swept away, and, after an interval, a new one was substituted. Such a substitution might be accepted *pro tanto* as a breach of continuity. The second could hardly be called the continuous successors of the first, for there is no *tertium quid* to connect them or to convey that inflow of church life from one to the other, which is the very meaning of continuity.

But it is just from any possibility of such a calamity that our Catholicity saves us. Our organism is not insular or local, nor at the mercy of local causes. It is, and always has been, part of a world-wide body of which the centre is the See of Rome. If the local pastorate of England were to apostatise or to be driven out of the land, the chief pastorate in the Apostolic See over the faithful here in England would still remain. To it, as much after the collapse as before it, English Catholics would still be subject. Under it they would still remain in perfect continuity with the Church at large, and through it with the English Church of their forefathers.

Whether the Chief Shepherd pastured them by missionaries, or by Vicars Apostolic, or, finally, restored to them a hierarchy, their position as part of the one flock would remain absolutely unchanged, and their continuity with every part and period of the flock would remain absolutely uninterrupted. Local parts of the Church flourish or fall, or are swept away by storms of persecution. The centre and main body remains, and from it, as time and tide permit,

the channels of life flow forth again to recover what was lost, to raise what has fallen, and to restore what has perished. As the See of Peter is the centre of our unity, so it is the main trunk of our continuity.

Catholics, of course, were not wanting in England between 1534 and 1570. But even if every Englishman had conformed to the Establishment, and if during that interval no Catholic could have been found in the country, then the first convert who returned to the Church would have no sooner stepped within the circle of Catholic unity than by the very fact he would have found himself sharing in the continuous life of the Church. He would have become one body with it. He would have placed himself in organic continuity with the Church of his forefathers and with the Church in all times and places.

Hence, no changes of mere local pastorate or hierarchy can affect the flow of our continuity. This truth is as plain as the fact upon which it rests—one of which the whole world is witness—that the Catholic Church is one visible body of which the life is shared by all its members.

The task of impugning our continuity, which lay before the writer in *The Times*, was a remarkably simple one. He should have proved one of two things—either that the Ancient Church of England was not one body with the Catholic Church and the Apostolic See, or—what would do just as well—that we Catholics of to-day are not. Until he has done either, he has done nothing. Things which are organically one with the same thing are organically one with one another.

We may note that besides organic, and liturgical and doctrinal (in other words, ecclesiastical), there is another form of continuity. It consists in the sameness of persons or fabrics or property, and may be called personal or *material* continuity. A Christian gentleman has a private chapel and a chaplain. Both he and his chaplain apostatise and become Mohammedans. He uses his chapel as a mosque, and his chaplain acts as priest. Here the gentleman and his chaplain are precisely the same *persons* after their

apostasy as they were before it. They worship in the same *building*, and possess the same *property*. Nothing is changed except the religion. This sameness of persons, buildings, endowments, is personal or material continuity. It is obviously independent of Church continuity, since no one would pretend that they belong to the same Church as they did before their apostasy. Far be it from us to compare Anglicanism with a non-Christian system, for we might easily have supposed that the gentleman became either a Lutheran or a Calvinist, but we use the illustration to point out that clearly we must have something more than the same race of people, the same religious edifices, the same religious property to make up a claim for Church continuity.

It is chiefly to this *material* continuity—the part which a non-theologian may safely judge, but so useless for its Church application—that Mr. Freeman bears anxious testimony when speaking of the English Reformation, in a passage which is often enlisted into the purposes of Anglican controversy. The something more—as essential as the soul is to the body—in completing the continuity of a Church, is sameness of religion, in other words, organical and doctrinal and liturgical continuity.

But the remaining set of five?

In the first, the writer asks if we are prepared to adopt the saying of St. Gregory the Great, who sent St. Augustine to England, that “whoever calls himself Universal Bishop is the precursor of Antichrist”? We answer. We adopt it heartily and unhesitatingly. We only make one proviso, one much too reasonable that any fair-minded person could be unwilling to grant it. We ask to be allowed to adopt St. Gregory’s words according to St. Gregory’s meaning, namely, according to the sense, in which from the context of his letter, his other writings, his acts and life, it is plain that he intended them.

St. Gregory denied that any one could be called “Universal Bishop” in the exclusive sense, or as he himself says over and over again, in a sense which would deprive all other patriarchal sees of their rights, or concentrate the

whole episcopal power of the Church in one person in such wise that, if he fell, the whole Church fell with him. The title thus understood implied that Christ had embodied the whole bishopric of the Church so exclusively in the person of one man, that all other bishops were to be to him but mere deputies or dependents. St. Gregory denied such a doctrine, and we deny it with him. The authority of the Church dwells in the whole Episcopate. The Episcopate is of Divine institution. The Bishops are not mere delegates of the Pope. They are his brethren and fellow-judges. They have been constituted by God the Holy Ghost with him to rule the Church of God. They are with the Pope sharers of his commission, and sharers of his solicitude. That fellowship or brotherhood does not for a moment exclude their obligation to use their authority as pastors in union with and in subordination to him, to whom Christ gave charge of the whole flock and the power of "confirming his brethren". Hence in the very letter in which St. Gregory denies the application of the title in its exclusive or monopolising sense (even to St. Peter), he declares that every person who can read the Gospel knows that "St. Peter the Prince of all the Apostles received from the Lord's lips the charge of the *whole Church*" (Epis., lib. iv., xxxii.).

Nothing certainly seems to have been further from the mind of St. Gregory than to deny for a moment the supremacy of his see over the Bishops of the Church. His whole life, letters and Pontificate were devoted to upholding it. His letter to Felix of Sardica, containing a sharp reprimand and a threat of punishment, is a fair example of the way in which he could express his authority to a recalcitrant Bishop. Far from supposing that he as "Pope had no jurisdiction in England," he committed all Bishops there to Augustine's rule, and gave him "authority" to found the hierarchy. Upon the authority of his see his testimony is absolute. As we have seen, in Letter XII. (lib. ix., Ind. ii.), speaking of Constantinople, then at the height of its power, he says: "With respect to the Constantinopolitan Church, who doubts that it is subject to the Apostolic See?" "I know not," he says in Letter LIX.,

“what Bishop is not subject to it, when fault is to be found with him.” His letters are filled with judgments and acts of jurisdiction and concessions of the Pallium with grants of vicarial powers addressed to Bishops all over Christendom. We have, therefore, no fear in adopting any of St. Gregory’s views as to Papal jurisdiction.

And the remaining four?

They are based upon an assumption. They beg as something to be conceded to them to begin with, a principle which is the utter reversal of the Church’s life and history, namely, that any movement of doctrinal or disciplinary development is incompatible with Church continuity. Precisely the reverse is true. We hold that such development, far from being out of harmony with continuity, is essential to it, and inseparable from it. It is just because the Church is the same from age to age, that she is able to adapt her discipline to the changing conditions of each. In traversing the centuries, she carries her Treasure of Truth—her Faith and Morals—unchanged. But by the very law of her life she unrolls it forth as she goes. She draws from it those inner truths and consequences—new to man but old to the Gospel—and which are not less a vital part of itself than the main articles of her Creed. She is the Scribe divinely learned in the Kingdom of Heaven drawing forth “from her treasure old things and new”. From this unfolding of the Truth-Treasure goes forth that sublime procession of her dogmas which extends from Nicæa to the Vatican, and which we call the Development of Doctrine. The very nature of such Development postulates continuity, just as a process of reasoning postulates the identity and continuity of the mind which reasons—or to carry the analogy into a lower domain—as growth and expansion postulates the identity and continuity of the individual tree thus growing and expanding. The glory of our Catholic Faith is that it is based on nothing less than the Word of God, and the Word of God without alloy. Development therefore is not the absorption of non-revealed matter, but the unfolding of that which has always been contained in revealed matter. Continuity is the logical basis of development, and develop-

ment, in things vital and intellectual, is the outcome of continuity. Hence in testing a religious system on the score of doctrinal continuity, we must look at once for its doctrinal development, we must look sharply to see whether the process has been true or false, regular or irregular, healthy or unsound, straight or perverted. But if we find it not at all, the system is dead, as the igneous rocks upon the ledge of an extinct crater, and we may take no further trouble about it. The writer who, in feeling the pulse of a religious system, and finding the doctrinal movement present, argues thereupon, not to the presence of life but to the absence of continuity, is surely far from even the first elements of a sound diagnosis.

But when we propose to answer arguments like numbers 4, 5, 6, 7, we should go straight to the point. People do not get to the point by first principles, but by last conclusions. Then a word to each.

The "cup to the laity" means either the administration of our Lord's Blood or of the chalice which contains it. If the first, we do not withhold it from the laity, for it is given to them in the Host, since our Lord's Body and Blood are inseparable. If the second, it is no longer a question of what is given, but a manner of giving it—a matter of mere rubrical regulation which has nothing to do with continuity.

"Marriage of the clergy" is not a matter of doctrine, but of discipline. The Church which tolerated a married clergy in the first few centuries, because she could not find a sufficiency of others, tolerates it no longer, because she can. That it was "not absolutely prohibited until the eleventh century" is untrue. It was absolutely prohibited to the priesthood and those in major orders in the third and fourth centuries. The prohibition is implied in the Apostolical Canons (25) and plainly set forth in the Councils of Elvira (A.D. 310) and Ancyra (A.D. 314), the Decretals of Popes Siricius (A.D. 385), Innocent I. (A.D. 405), and the decisions of Gregory the Great to the Sicilian Bishops, and implied in his directions to St. Augustine here in England (Bede, i., 27).

In certain parts of Germany, as here, under a Primate like Stigand, discipline was at times sadly relaxed, and the task of bringing the misguided stragglers into line was not always quickly or easily accomplished. But the law of the Church was always in force, its observance and recognition never ceased to be canonical and general, while its violation was never more than local or spasmodic. Dean Plumtre, a Protestant writer, concludes an exhaustive article on the subject (*Dict. Christian Antiq.*) by thus speaking of the action of Pope Hildebrand or Gregory VII. in the eleventh century :—

“Enough has been said to show that when Hildebrand entered on his crusade against the marriage of the clergy, he was simply acting on and enforcing what had been for about seven centuries the dominant rule of the Church. The confusions of the period that had preceded this had relaxed the discipline, but the law of the Church remained unaltered.”

On Transubstantiation the writer falls into the error of supposing that a doctrine in the Catholic Church is an “open question” until it is defined. The word “transubstantiation” was adopted by later councils as the word “consubstantial” was adopted at Nicæa. But we hold that the *doctrine* of transubstantiation was never an “open question,” in the sense that the Lutheran or Calvinistic doctrines had ever a standing ground in the magisterium of the Catholic Church.

Papal Infallibility and the Immaculate Conception are definitions evolved in the ordinary course of doctrinal development, and no more affect the continuity of the Church than the definitions of the *ὁμοούσια* at Nicæa, the *Θεοτόκος* at Ephesus, or the twofold nature of Christ at Chalcedon. Catholics of the sixth century remained in continuity with Catholics of the first, although they could not and would not refuse assent to the doctrines thus developed and defined. We, too, can remain in continuity with both without “surrendering” the Papal Infallibility and the Immaculate Conception.

CHAPTER XVII.

A Diocese as an Object-lesson in Continuity.

(17TH JANUARY, 1891.)

ONE presentment of continuity-ism seems to us suggestive of certain feats of amateur prestidigitation. Take a line of post-Reformation bishops in a given see. Take the line of pre-Reformation bishops of the same see. Put the two ends together and hold your hand firmly closed over the ends so as to conceal their severance. To an audience who may not be sufficiently near to discover the difference of colour and texture, the line will appear like a single thread of continuous and unbroken succession.

For instance:—

Speaking of the late Archbishop Magee, *The Church Times* (27th Feb., 1891) furnishes the following statistics:—

It may interest some of our readers to know that Dr. Magee, the new Archbishop of York, will be the 100th holder of that see. No other diocese of the Northern Province has had so many bishops. In the Province of Canterbury, however, St. Davids has had 117, Norwich 105, and Worcester 103 bishops respectively. London, since the time of St. Augustine, has had 106, but previous to that, when it was the Metropolitan See of England, it is said to have had 16 archbishops, which will make it *facile princeps*. Dr. Davidson, the elect of Rochester, also completes the "century" of bishops of that diocese.

Here each of the diocesan threads appears as one, and the hand is carefully held over the break at the Reformation.

No need to say that such paragraphs are not due to any conscious wish to create an illusion. Those who sincerely have brought themselves to believe in the theory of Anglican continuity will just as sincerely formulate such conclusions as its natural outcome. We merely state the effect as we see it, and say why we decline to believe in it.

The threads of succession as presented are not in a sense continuous, except in so far as mere physical occupation of the same house renders a succession of tenants continuous. Up to a given point, the bishops of these various sees were

Roman Catholic. After that point they were just as clearly Anglican, or what they themselves would not have hesitated to describe with emphasis as "Protestant".

How can we tell?

Easily.

If two men—one an Anglican and one a Roman Catholic—are set before us, there can be no difficulty whatever in distinguishing the one from the other.

How?

By using three plain and sufficiently simple tests.

These tests are no mere matter of *à priori* dexterity by which the prints in the sand are found to fit the shoe only because they were made by it. We may safely submit them to the justice and judgment of each individual to examine them on the score of their fairness.

They are as follows:—

A Roman Catholic.

An Anglican.

1. Is one who receives and believes all Articles of Faith which the Catholic Church in communion with the See of Rome proposes to his belief.

1. Is one who does *not* receive and believe all Articles of Faith which the Catholic Church in communion with the See of Rome proposes to his belief.

2. Is one who is recognised as a fellow-Catholic by the Churches abroad in communion with the See of Rome.

2. Is one who is *not* recognised as a fellow-Catholic by the Churches abroad in communion with the See of Rome.

3. Is one who recognises the Pope as the Supreme Head of the whole Church and the Vicar of Christ.

3. Is one who does *not* recognise the Pope as the Supreme Head of the Church and the Vicar of Christ.

Are these tests fair? Are they such that the honest common-sense of men can recognise and accept them?

To us they certainly seem so.

But if so, let us use them to see whether the English Bishops before the Reformation were Roman Catholics. The triple test of Roman Catholicism obviously fits us. And as plainly, we think, it fits them.

As a working experiment, we could hardly do better than take the above-mentioned See of York.

We scan the lists of its bishops as given in the *Fasti* by Le Neve, and "corrected by Sir Thomas D. Hardy, the Keeper of the Public Records". One object is to see how far recognition of Roman authority (test No. 3) entered into the making of the Northern Primates.

After the conversion of the English people and the founding of the English Church the first Archbishop of York was Paulinus, a Roman monk sent by Pope Gregory. St. Bede (l. ii., c. 17) tells us that he received the Roman Pall from Pope Honorius in 634. That the giving of the Pall meant was not merely honorific, but authoritative, is plain from the very terms of the grant. (See page 63.)

The English See of York, like the See of Canterbury, was thus born in an Act of Roman Jurisdiction, and had a Roman Pall for its swathing-band.

To Paulinus succeeded Wilfrid, the most irrepressible ultramontane of Anglo-Saxon times. He expressed his recognition of Roman Supremacy, as we have seen, by appealing to Rome three times, and despite the opposition to his appeal won from Bishops, Primates and Kings a public profession of their determination "to obey in all things the commands of the Apostolic See" (Eddius, *Vita St. Wilfridi*, c. xlvi.).

Egbert, Albert, Eanbald I., Eanbald II., Oswald, Aelfric and Aldred, Anglo-Saxon Archbishops of York, received episcopal confirmation and the Pall from the Holy See. The last two went in person to Rome for the purpose.

Aldred, the last Anglo-Saxon Primate, received by way of compensation for his long journey a practical lesson in the way of detachment.

He had been already Bishop of Worcester, and, on his promotion to York, felt his love for both sees so great that he wished to hold the one without letting go the other. On arriving in Rome, he asked for the Pall which implied Papal confirmation in his new archbishopric. Pope Nicholas not only refused him the Pall, but deprived him of Worcester.

Aldred left the Holy City, relieved of his hopes and his bishoprics. When crossing the Alps, a band of robbers relieved him of whatever remained. Thus chastened he returned to the Pope. By dint of persistent pleading, he obtained the Papal confirmation in the Archbishopric of York, having protested his entire willingness to be content with it alone.

Thomas, the first Norman Primate, like the last Anglo-Saxon one, had at Rome some impressive experiences to which we have already alluded.

He had been consecrated in an irregular manner. The Bishop of Lincoln (then Dorchester) was for other reasons in much the same plight. Lanfranc, the Primate, took the two offenders with him to the Holy City, and stated their case to the Pope. Thereupon the Bishops resigned their episcopal rings and croziers into the hands of the Pope, and threw themselves upon his indulgence. Taking it all in all, such conduct on the part of both Primate and Bishops seems a fairly practical way of recognising Papal Supremacy. It is gratifying to know that at Lanfranc's intercession the Pope restored their staves to the Primate, and allowed him to reinstate them (Eadmer, 6-7).

In 1119 Thurstan, Archbishop of York, refused to accept consecration from the Southern Primate. He was consecrated by Pope Eugenius at Rome (Simon Dunelm).

When he died, in 1140, there was a somewhat lively exercise of Roman authority at York.

The Chapter elected King Stephen's nephew.

The Pope refused him.

Thereupon the Chapter elected William Fitzherbert, and (despite the opposition of the Archbishop of Canterbury) he was consecrated by the King's brother, the Bishop of Winchester.

But Rome had still to be reckoned with.

The Pope examined the case, and deprived William of the see "as one intruded by Royal Authority" (*Anglia Sacra*, i., 71).

The luckless Chapter made a third try.

The majority of votes were given in favour of the Bishop of Chichester. The second candidate, Henry Murdac, Abbot of Fountains, was left in a minority.

The Pope set aside the election, and appointed the rejected candidate.

William Fitzherbert, the successor of the same Henry Murdac, was very much handled by the Popes. He was deprived by one Pope, restored by a second, and canonised by a third. Roger of Bishopbridge, who succeeded him in 1154, was temporarily suspended by the Pope for crowning Prince Henry in contravention of a Papal command.

In 1258 the Chapter elected to the see their Dean, William de Rudderfield.

The Pope quashed the election, and—"out of the plenitude of the Apostolic Power"—provided Walter Giffard.

Archbishops Corbridge (1300) and Grenfield (1306) were both consecrated at Rome. William de la Zouche (1374) was consecrated at Avignon by Clement VI.

Archbishops de Neville (1374), Arundel (1388), Waldby (1397), Lescope (1398), Bowet (1407), Kemp (1426), Boothe (1452), Nevile (1465), Boothe (1476), Scot (1480), Savage (1501), Bainbridge (1508), and Wolsey (1514)—were all appointed, like Archbishop Giffard, by Papal Provision, that is to say, independently of election, and by a summary exercise of Apostolic Authority—or "*ex plenitudine Apostolicæ potestatis*," as the King's Writ often expressed it.

When the Pope did not himself provide, he invariably confirmed the appointment.

Dr. Magee, Archbishop of York, in his address, delivered on the occasion of his enthronement, took occasion to remark that:—

The work of Paulinus, of Chad, or of Wilfrid, or of their predecessors in the British Church, was of necessity very different in its character from that which was needed in the days of Longley, or Thomson, or Magee.

The Archbishop was referring to difficulties of missionary enterprise, but we take it that his observation holds good in more ways than one.

For instance, Paulinus and his successors would have begun their work by soliciting the Pall and the confirmation of the Roman Pontiff. By going to Rome or sending to Rome for the Pall and being invested with the Vicarial powers of the Holy See, they gave the most practical proof of Roman jurisdiction in England.

Archbishops Longley, Thomson and Magee began their work by doing just the opposite, by signing a declaration that the "Bishop of Rome hath no jurisdiction in this realm of England".

As a matter of fact, the Primacy of the See of York is in itself a monumental refutation of the Anglican theory.

As soon as St. Augustine had "converted the English," and was enthroned as Archbishop of Canterbury, according to the Anglican view, Pope Gregory ought to have said to him:—

"You are now an Archbishop and a Primate, equal in all things to myself, and independent of my authority. You are in England what I am in Rome. It is for you to regulate the new Church that you have founded. I cannot interfere in the internal concerns of structure or policy."

But St. Gregory did not speak or act in that way.

Very much the contrary. He insisted that St. Augustine should create a second Primacy in the North—inside the "realm of England". Moreover, he declared that this Northern Archbishop should be brought into direct relation with Rome, and, like Augustine himself, should seek the Pall from "this see which I now serve".

Thus the very dignity of the Northern See was due to the fact that England was *not* handed over to Augustine as an independent Bishop—as according to the Anglican theory it ought to have been—but kept not less than Canterbury under Roman control. Its primacy is the proof that from the very outset the hand of Rome was held firmly upon the helm of the Church in England.

So, too, the mutual rights and relations of York and Canterbury continued to be regulated by the decrees of the Popes.

If we can credit the records of the famous adjudication between Lanfranc and Thomas of York, when the latter had appealed to the Pope, Lanfranc himself tells the Holy Father how the whole matter has been adjusted according to the decisions of the Roman See:—

“Finally, as the pith and foundation of the whole case, were produced the charters and writings of your predecessors Gregory, Boniface, Honorius, Vitalian, Sergius, Gregory II. and Leo I. and Leo the latest, which in various cases and from time to time had been given or sent to the Archbishops of Canterbury and the English Kings” (Wilkins, vol. i., 327).

In the same document Lanfranc bears witness that 150 years before his time, in the dioceses claimed for the Province of York, the Archbishops of Canterbury, having held councils, had deposed bishops “*by the authority of the Roman See*”.

Apparently at that time—a century and a half before the Conquest—“the Bishop of Rome *had* jurisdiction in this realm of England”.

Perhaps no Yorkshireman ever attained to such European fame as Alcuin.

He was the disciple of Archbishop Egbert, who was himself the disciple of St. Bede. He was the chief teacher in the great school of York. He had for his pupil Archbishop Eanbald. When Eanbald became Archbishop he sent Alcuin as his envoy to Rome to solicit the Papal Pall. It was in returning from Rome that Alcuin met the Emperor Charlemagne, and was induced by him to undertake that vast educational work which resulted in the founding of the Palatine Schools in France.

Thus the master-hand of the Yorkshireman was laid to the foundations of one of the earliest and chiefest structures in the fabric of European education.

As the pupil of one Archbishop of York and the teacher of another, a leader of learning, both in England and on the

Continent, Alcuin may be trusted to know precisely, and to express correctly, what were in his day the relations between the See of York and the See of Rome.

The following is the letter in which Alcuin petitions the Pope Leo III. to grant the Pall to Archbishop Eanbald, just promoted to the See of York.

It was written in 797 :—

“To the Most Holy Father Pope Leo, the humble levite,
Alcuin, greeting.

“Last year, by means of Enghilbert, a child of our learning, a prudent man, faithful to his friends, and deeply devoted to the progress of God’s Holy Church, I besought your favour, most Blessed Father, that you would take me, as if I were your own son, to the bosom of your Apostolic blessing.

“Upon his return, he earnestly assured me that my petition had been graciously received by the fostering kindness of your authority. Hence I, all overflowing with joy, all filled with gladness, have deemed myself happy in my union with so great a Father.

“And now, encouraged by reliance on your inviolable promise, I venture to address my humble letters to your Holiness, and to renew the memory of our name in the spiritual tablets of your most holy heart. The increase of the flock is the reward of the shepherd. Behold me, then, Most Blessed Father, as a sheep sick with sin, I have recourse to your solace, and beseech you that you will aid me by your intercession to Him, who redeemed me by His Blood. For, according to St. James the Apostle, ‘the prayer of the just man availeth much’. Hence a single prayer added fifteen years to the life of a king (4 Kings xx. 6).

“But also I humbly implore the bounty of your affection for those envoys who have come from my country and my city [York] in accordance with the canonical custom, and according to the Apostolic command of our teacher, St. Gregory, to petition for the dignity of the Sacred Pall, that you would graciously accept the prayer which springs from ecclesiastical need. For in those countries, the authority of

the Sacred Pall is exceedingly necessary, to subdue the perversity of the evilly-disposed, and to preserve the authority of Holy Church.

“Wherefore, Most Holy Father, and best of Pastors, have pity upon your children, and give increase to the flock which Christ God has entrusted to you. And thus with the manifold fruit of your labour, may you appear glorious in the sight of our Lord Jesus Christ” (*Monumenta Alcuiniana*, Jaffé, vol. vi. ; *Bibliotheca rerum Germanicarum*, 358).

Reading it, we can only hope and pray that a time may come when the sadness of schism and heresy shall have passed away, and when Northumbria, true to the spirit of Paulinus and Eanbald, and true to its own loyal and historical self, will once more as of old hold out its arms to Rome and pour forth its heart to the Chief Pastor of Christendom in letters like those of Alcuin.

In the above, we have the voice of Yorkshire to Rome in the very noontide of the Anglo-Saxon period.

Such is a sample of the record of Romanism in the See of York.

We have only to look into the lists of the other dioceses of England to find that the hand of St. Peter was certainly not less busy or less strong in stringing the Bishops on the thread of succession.

Prelates who held their sees under such conditions can hardly be said to have failed in their fulfilment of the Third Test—the recognition of Roman Supremacy. That they give an equally clear response to the two preceding tests is something too obvious for proof.

The Southern Primates were not less, but more pronounced in their recognition of Papal authority:—

“Most Blessed Father, only Supreme, and undoubted Pontiff, Vicar of Jesus Christ upon earth, most devoutly kissing your blessed feet with all promptitude of service and obedience”—is the formula with which Archbishop Chicheley, in 1426, begins his letter to Pope Martin V.

One may doubt if even Louis Veillot or the late Mgr.

Pie of Poitiers—or any other “*ultramontain enragé*”—would have cared to say more!

A glance at the Consecration Oaths of the two sets of Bishops will bring into sufficiently clear relief on which side of the triple test above mentioned each set is to be found.

Before their Consecration

The Pre-Reformation Bishops publicly swore to be “*faithful and obedient to St. Peter and to my Lord the Pope, and to his canonical successors*”.

“*The rights, honours, privileges, and authority of the Church of Rome, and of Our Lord the Pope, and of his successors, I will be careful to preserve, to promote, to defend, and to increase.*”

“*The Roman Papacy, and the prerogatives of St. Peter I will be their helper to keep and to defend against all men.*”

(Rymer’s *Fœdera*, vol. xiii., 392.)

The Post-Reformation Bishops publicly swore “*to never consent or agree that the Busshope of Rome shall practyse, exercyse, or have any manner of auctoryte, juryisdiction, or power within this realme of England,*”

and

“*to observe, keape, and mayntayne and defend th’ oole effects and contents of all and singular acts and statutes made and to be made within this realme in derogation, extirpation, and extinguishment of the Busshope of Rome and his auctorytice*”.

(Wilkins’ *Concilia*, vol. iii., 855.)

Between Bishops who swear in the one column and those who swear in the other, there is plainly the same difference which exists to-day between the ordinary Roman Catholic and the ordinary Anglican—between those who openly recognise the Pope’s authority and those who openly reject it.

To hold up as if it were a single thread, a succession of which one part is made up of Bishops undoubtedly Catholic and devotedly Roman, and the other of prelates constituted on post-Reformation principles, and to ignore or keep from

view this yes-and-no difference between them, so that of two not only distinct but antagonistic successions there shall appear to be one, is a feat which finds its best apology in the very obviousness of its failure.

The very progress of Anglican ideas over the ruin of the older forms of Protestantism, and the once popular Reformation beliefs, teaches the moral that peoples in the long run invariably grow weary and sick of ideals which are untrue.

Where such stalwart beliefs have failed, the continuity theory is of all things the least likely to survive or to succeed. Even if nine generations held it the tenth would find it out, and a day would come when educated Englishmen would treat it with amused indifference, as they do to-day the belief that the Pope is Antichrist—a theory for which Anglican writers and divines did yeomen's service for more than two centuries after the Reformation.

CHAPTER XVIII.

The Catholic Constitution of the Church and the Royal Supremacy.

(7TH FEBRUARY, 1891.)

Is the Lambeth controversy travelling to the question of Royal *versus* Church Supremacy? One might think so, for the subject of the Royal Supremacy and its place in the Anglican system has recently been upon the lips of three important personages.

Lord Grimthorpe has, as we have seen, made it the basis of his plea for an appeal against the Archbishop's Judgment. To him the whole of the points of ritual combined are but a small matter compared with the paramount issue—is the Crown or the spirituality to have the last word in the decisions of ritual doctrine?

Then the Bishop of Carlisle said in his Annual Pastoral:—

As to the appeal to the Queen in Council I do not look upon an appeal to the Crown in the last resort with apprehension and dislike. The doctrine that the Queen is in all causes within her dominions, whether ecclesiastical or civil, supreme, appears to me to be one of the foundations of our ecclesiastical and civil freedom.

Finally, a still more significant utterance comes from one who is certainly not a less important actor in the drama than either the Bishop of Carlisle or Lord Grimthorpe. The Bishop of Lincoln has made a manifesto upon the doctrine of the Royal Supremacy. In one sense it is disappointing. In view of Lord Grimthorpe's pronouncements we should have expected the liberty-loving section of Anglicanism to have ranged itself on the side of spiritual independence, and we should have expected the Bishop of Lincoln to have voiced the highest and most courageous traditions of his school. Either Anglicanism has no tradition on the point to be voiced—which one hardly cares to believe—or the Bishop of Lincoln has not seen his way to act as its tribune :—

First, it is necessary for us to show that we are loyal lovers of our country and upholders of the true supremacy of the Crown in all matters ecclesiastical as well as civil. Secondly, it is necessary for us to show that we do not desire to submit to the ambitious and arrogant claims of the Church of Rome as she made them in the Middle Ages, or to re-introduce those superstitions and corrupt practices which were laid aside at the time of the Reformation, or to accept the novel additions to the Creed which she has made in our own day.

That, we presume, is not a mere stripping for the conflict, with a view to leave Lord Grimthorpe and his friends just as little as possible to lay hold of. Much less need we regard it as the prudent taking down of sail at the approach of a storm. The Bishop feels, no doubt, as Catholics often feel, that where issues have to be fought out, it is always well to begin by clearing the question, and plainly marking off the position to be held ; and the smaller the area to be defended the better the chances of defence. This view of his attitude is confirmed by the fact that the Bishop not merely concedes the Royal Supremacy, but enters at once upon an earnest defence of it :—

In a word, we have to show that our aim is to maintain the truly primitive and Catholic character of the Church of England, according to the words of the Creed which she has preserved, and which she bids her children to learn, "I believe in One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church". This is neither the time nor the place to set out the terms of war upon which the Church ought to fight in

order that she may obey the Scriptural command "to contend earnestly for the faith"; and yet one or two words may not be altogether unprofitable. First, then, let us remember this, that all power is of God. "The powers that be are ordained of God." From the time that emperors and kings became Christians the Church has at all times acknowledged their power, and when not abused it was cheerfully submitted to, and even anomalies were borne with for a time and amended when possible.

One has only to read this passage once to feel how wide and deep is the chasm which separates the Anglican and the Catholic in their very first idea of the constitution of the Church.

To us, the Catholic Church, Christ's Kingdom upon earth is a Christ-made Society. Made by God, she is structurally perfect. She is complete, supreme, and independent in her own order. Her work is to worship God and to save souls. To do it, she has been given "all power" by Him who sent her even as He was sent. She thus possesses the spiritual sovereignty, and in it, the fulness of legislative, judicial and constituent and executive authority within the kingdom of souls. She has need of no temporal prince to make her laws, to try her causes, and to appoint her officers or sanction her mandates. Her ecclesiastics are indeed the subjects of earthly monarchs in things which pertain to the civil order, just as kings and princes are in turn subject to them in the spiritual order. But Church and State stand side by side *de jure* co-ordinate, independent and sovereign, each within its own domain. Thus the Church walks the earth clothed with the royalty of Christ. It is well for the world, and for the work she does in it, that she should be free even as religion and conscience are free. Naturally she has had to reckon with Cæsar. He began by being her enemy. Then he became her friend, helper and protector. Later on history presents him as an ally, with whom she played the part of give and take. But enemy, friend or ally, her master he has never been, as Constantius, Anastasius, King John, Henry II., Henry IV. of Germany, and Bismarck—a few amid the long line of baffled and beaten despots who are strewn along her path—have learned to their cost.

In marked contrast to this, the Catholic conception of the Church of Christ, we have the Anglican theory of the Royal Supremacy. Let us put it at a minimum.

Cæsar is to the Church her supreme governor upon earth. He rules her. He confirms her laws. He, in final instance, determines the formularies of belief and worship to be used in her Churches. He is final Court of Appeal in all her causes. He appoints her Bishops. Practically, it is for him to say what she shall teach, and whom she shall employ to teach it. The Reformation and the legislation of Henry VIII., Edward VI. and Elizabeth are the concrete application of the principle. Quite true Cæsar does not become a clergyman. He does not administer the Eucharist. And the jest of Francis I. that he expected every morning to hear that his brother the King of England (Henry VIII.) had sung High Mass, was after all quite superfluous. But he appoints the one who does celebrate the Eucharist, and decides the words and way in which he shall administer it. He does not mount into the pulpit. But he fixes the limits of doctrine inside which the preacher must keep when he gets there. If he finds that certain men do not preach a given doctrine, or follow a given policy, he can appoint others who will. As long as he can man the Sees he can always tune the Episcopate and the pulpits. Nor does it sensibly better the case to plead that in doing all this Cæsar invariably takes the advice of his Churchmen. It would be surprising if he did not. But throughout the entire movement of Church government, Cæsar it is who does it. It is he who is at work. It is, in the long run, his will and his word that say and seal and lend effective validity to the whole proceeding. He is the motive power of the Church machinery.

Anglicans can hardly wonder if to us such a system, however veiled, modified and safeguarded, is radically and incurably Erastian, and if any Church built on such a system can ever seem to us anything else than what an eminent Protestant lawyer has ungraciously called it—a religious “department of the Civil Service”.

This is the fact—the hard, unlovely Erastian fact—of which the Bishop of Lincoln, if we read him aright—

would seek to soften the edges by a compromise. He would retain and uphold the Royal Supremacy. But he would have the Crown exercise it only through the Church. The King shall wear his crown. But when he rules the Church his arm shall be in lawn sleeves.

But then it must be remembered the authority was confided to emperors and kings as Christians, and on the general principle that the power of the Christian prince was exercised on the Church through the Church. Thus it has been well expressed by one who has done very much for the restoration of the principles and practices of primitive Christianity in the Church of England in our day, that the early kings and emperors "set in motion her own powers and functions, but did not act for her, much less against her". The same writer again says that these early kings "did not legislate for the Church apart from herself". "In the ordinary cases of the Church's judgment, however, whatever case the civil power exercised by way of ultimate appeal it exercised through the Church itself. By custom neither the sovereign nor any civil representatives were present at an ecclesiastical trial."

If the Bishop intended his manifesto to be helpful in the present crisis of thought, it was surely the moment for definiteness and lucidity:—

"That the early kings and emperors set in motion her own powers and functions, but did not act for her"—is one of those dexterously misty locutions that mean almost everything or next to nothing, just as you are pleased to understand it. No one doubts that the poorest subject in the land who brings a case before the tribunals of the Church "sets her in motion". But that, as the Bishop cannot but know, is something vastly and widely different from being the motive power and the supreme judge "in all causes civil or ecclesiastical".

There is but one other intelligible meaning. The King, as the fount of jurisdiction, is the supreme originating and controlling agent who calls the power of the Church into motion. But to accept such a meaning is to reduce the Church to the position of a mannikin. She will act if the King will wind her up and set her agoing. Surely the Bishop would not have us believe that Christ instituted His Church to do a world-wide work, and left her in a state of

functional paralysis except when the touch of some earthly monarch awakened her with a sort of *præmotio physica* into activity.

The hypothesis is marvellous beyond the limits of the credible. Perhaps that would not matter so much if it only did what it was intended to do—put the theory of Church government upon a rational and non-Erastian basis. But that is precisely what it fails to do. It leaves Henry VIII. where it found him. Whether the King governs the Church by his lay judges and Privy Councillors, or by his Bishops and Ecclesiastics the position remains unchanged. It is the King who rules. It is the Church who is ruled. The Church has still the civil power for her master. What boots it to shut out lay judges from the Church's courts when the lay power in the person of the King is still her supreme head and governor? The layman may wear a wig, or he may wear a crown, but wig or crown, he is still a layman, with all the lay power behind him. Even to put a stole on the King and call him a semi-ecclesiastic or *persona mixta* does not really better the position. It is as King and as Cæsar that he wears the stole, and plays the ecclesiastic. The Church—which to enlightened Anglicans ought to be the Spouse of Christ—is still in the degrading position of a bondmaiden to Cæsar!

The Anglican theory of Royal Supremacy has a threefold defect.

It is unscriptural. Christ in His Gospel speaks much and frequently of "His kingdom," the Church. But where is there the remotest hint that earthly kings are to be the heads and rulers of it?

"Be subject to the powers that be"—"*The powers that be are ordained of God,*" pleads the Bishop.

Undoubtedly, but who *are* the powers that be? St. Peter and the Apostles, or their successors, the Pope and Episcopate, are for the government of the Church, and in things spiritual, just as truly "the powers that be" and "the powers ordained of God" as kings and emperors are for the government of the State in things temporal.

That was the answer which Pope Symmachus (A.D. 498-514) gave to an Emperor nearly a century before Augustine landed in England. In his letter to Anastasius, the Pope says: "Perhaps you will say—It is written that we ought 'to be subject to every power'. But we recognise the human powers in their own sphere, until they lift up their wills against God. Besides, if 'all power is of God,' that is chiefly the case of the power which presides over the things which are Divine. Do you yield deference to God in us, and we shall yield deference to God in you" (Epist., vi.; Mansi, viii., 215).

A second defect in the theory is that it is unhistorical.

For the first three centuries of the history of the primitive Church, it was clearly impossible and out of the question. That fact alone would suffice to remove it from the list of things which can be classed as integral parts of the Church's constitution. After the conversion of Constantine, the Christian emperors played, as we might expect, an important part in the history of the Church. They collected the Bishops together for the General Councils. They or their commissioners took a prominent part in their proceedings. They received from the Bishops the decisions arrived at, and promulgated them, enforced by civil sanctions in various parts of their dominions. In all of which there is everything to show that Cæsar was acting for the Church and under the Church, but nothing to show that he was over it or above it. His action was ever outside the ruling machinery of the Church. It was collateral to it and distinct from it. It was not canonical or inside, much less as an organic head. Where have any documents of councils, fathers or ecclesiastical writers ever styled the emperor "head or supreme governor of the Church"? Not even Byzantine flattery ever went so far as to imply that "the most pious, most Christian, most august Emperor" was the supreme ruler in the Church's government.

When the Emperor Marcian caused to be held the General Council of Chalcedon, he acknowledged to the Pope that he had done so by the Pope's Authority—"te auctore" (Epis. Leonis, 73). When the same Council reported its proceed-

ings to the Pope for "confirmation and assent," the Fathers describe the presiding presence of the Emperor or his commissioners as being of an exterior or police character. "The faithful Emperors presided for good order sake" (*πρὸς εὐκοσμίαν*). But when they speak of the presidency of the Pope, they at once mark it off as official and organic. "Over whom (the Council) thou didst preside in the person of thy representatives, as the head over the members, showing forth thy benevolence" (Epist. Synod: *ad Leonem*; Mansi, vi., 147).

The letters of the Popes express the same principle with sufficient clearness. In the letter of Pope Symmachus, just before the passage cited above, the Pope, accusing the Emperor Anastasius of favouring the party at Alexandria says:—

"Is it because you are an Emperor that you would try your strength against Peter? You receive Peter of Alexandria, and oppose Blessed Peter the Apostle, in the person of his unworthy Vicar? . . . Let us compare the dignity of the Emperor with the dignity of the Pontiff. Between the two there is as much difference as between one who has charge of human things, and one who has charge of things Divine. You, the Emperor, receive from the Pontiff baptism and the Sacraments. You ask his prayers, you hope for his blessing, you seek from him penance. Finally, you administer human things; he administers to you the things that are Divine. Thence the dignity is equal, not to say superior."

That is not a theory of subordination or Royal Supremacy.

Some ten years earlier (about 493) another Pope, Gelasius I., addresses the Emperor in much the same terms:—

"There are two things, august Emperor, by which this world is sovereignly ruled (*principaliter regitur*)—the sacred authority of the Pontiffs and the power of Kings. In which the responsibility of the priests is the much more weighty since they must render an account to the Lord even for the kings in the day of the last judgment. For you are aware, most gracious son, that although you preside by your dignity over the human race, yet devoutly you bow the neck to those who are rulers in things Divine. . . ."

A little farther on he applies this principle with the force of an *à fortiori* to the Roman See:—

“And if it is fitting that the hearts of the faithful should be subject in common to all priests who rightly handle the things that are of God, how much more is assent to be yielded to the ruler of that See whom the Most Holy God has been pleased to place pre-eminent above the whole priesthood—the See which the devotion of the whole Church constantly acclaims with deference? Wherein your piety perceived that no one by any mere human wisdom can in any way raise himself up to the privilege and the confession of him whom the voice of Christ set before all, whom the Holy Church ever has acknowledged, and devoutly holds as Primate” (Epist. Gelasii; Mansi, viii., 31).

That is not the language of one who was prepared to admit either Royal or Imperial Supremacy.

It is precisely because the Spiritual Power was supreme, and because the Civil Power happily was not, that the Church was able to fight, and to win the battle of Orthodoxy against Arianism and Nestorianism in the fourth and fifth centuries. The struggle and the victory—which fills both centuries—are the monuments of the primitive recognition of the Spiritual as against the Royal Supremacy. They are, at the same time, a refutation which removes from primitive Church history any possible standing ground for the Tudor theory.

The letters of Archbishop Peckham to Edward I.; the declaration of Archbishop Stratford to Edward III.; the constitution of Archbishop Arundel on the observance of the Canons (printed in Lyndwood's *Provinciale*); and finally the remarkable protest of Archbishop Warham on the “two powers,” written just before his death, all bear eloquent witness that the Erastian doctrine had no place in the life and teaching of the Church before the Reformation.

A third defect and point of weakness in the theory concerns the present and the future. If Christ intended princes to be the heads of His Church, it naturally occurs to ask what is to be done in countries where the form of government may be Republican, or where the Church is disestab-

lished? Did Christ construct His Church on the provision that none of the nations to be evangelised would adopt at any time any constitutional form other than that of Empire or Monarchy, or, that in all cases the State would invariably adopt the Church as an establishment? In no other circumstances will the theory fit in. These are conditions which cannot be essentially Catholic, since they are not workable or obtainable in all times and all places. They are part of the sands which are plainly liable to be swept away by the falling rains and the coming floods which assail the foundations of all human institutions. They cannot, therefore, be essential elements in the structure of the Church, or part of the rock on which Christ has built His House, and against which the time-tempest will surge in vain. The doctrine of the Royal Supremacy is, by its very terms, the theory of a particular place, condition and time. It is hopelessly local and periodic in contradistinction to Catholic. It is more. It is plainly based upon a prevision that is pitifully human in its narrowness. It is the expedient of a founder who could not see or even think beyond the horizon of his own era. The two hundred millions who are to populate the United States a century hence would probably regard any proposal for its application as a proof of political insanity. It is hopelessly human in contradistinction to the work that is perennial and Divine. It may be a matter of taste, when we say that to us the Royal Supremacy in religion seems all that is worldly, and spiritually servile and degrading. But it is matter, not of taste, but of internal evidence, that such a theory could not have formed part of the Divine constitution of a Church that was to teach all nations, and work in all conditions of time and of place, and only to cease from her work when there should be no longer a world to work in.

CHAPTER XIX.

An Anglican Episcopal Election.

(14TH FEBRUARY, 1891.)

It is to the praise of Anglicanism that it seeks to infuse a spirit of religion and reverence into ceremonies and proceed-

ings which the after-damp of the Reformation had chilled into being purely formal and perfunctory. A fair sample of such progress is found in the method of carrying out episcopal elections.

In January, 1891, Dr. Magee was transferred from the See of Peterborough to that of York. The *congé d'élire*, or royal licence to elect was thereupon issued to the Dean and Chapter. In it Queen Victoria recommends Dr. Magee, and requires them to proceed to his election.

The Record relates what happened in consequence:—

Upon the procession being formed, the Chapter, preceded by the choir singing the first two verses of the well-known hymn, "The Church's one Foundation," proceeded to the Chapter House. The choir halted and divided in the vestibule, the members of the Chapter passing into the Chapter House. The President having formally declared the Chapter open, the procession re-formed and returned to the choir, the choiristers singing the remainder of the hymn. As soon as the company had taken their seats, the Deau of York delivered an address, in the course of which he gave an exhaustive review of the mode of the election of Bishops, showing that the custom did not, as commonly supposed, date from the period of the Reformation, but had a much more ancient origin. At the close of the address the Rev. A. S. Commeline said the Litany, after which the hymn *Veni Creator* was sung by the choir. The Chapter then returned to the Chapter House, where the election was formally made, and afterwards the service in the Minster concluded.

And at Winchester the same ceremony was carried out in favour of Dr. Thorold, who was transferred to that see from Rochester.

The Western Morning News gave the following interesting report of the proceedings:—

The Dean of Winchester (Dr. Kitchin) decided that the ceremony should be carried out strictly according to the ancient custom of the see. The Dean read the first lesson, and then the Cathedral great bell was tolled, during which time the Dean and Chapter—the latter including the Bishop of Guildford, Archdeacon Haigh, Archdeacon Sapte, and Canons Warburton and Durst—preceded by the Minor Canons, the lay clerks and choir, proceeded to the doors of the Chapter House, the choir and Minor Canons waiting in the south transept while the Dean and Chapter entered for the purpose of proceeding with the election. Having first ascertained that no unqualified person was present, the Dean read the *congé*

d'élire from the Queen, and proposed to the Canons the name of the person therein designated as Bishop. The election having thus taken place, the Chapter Clerk was instructed to see that an instrument was at once prepared under the common seal of the Cathedral Church, and transmitted to Her Majesty, and that due notification was sent to the Archbishop of Canterbury and the newly-elected Bishop. The election proceedings lasted under a quarter of an hour, and when they had concluded a merry peal was rung on the Cathedral bells. The procession meanwhile returned to the choir, Wesley's *Te Deum* being sung as they proceeded along.

Then followed the announcement of the result to the people :—

After all had taken their seats in the appointed places, the Dean, standing in front of the Holy Table, said : “ Good Christian people here assembled together, be it known unto you and all others of the fold of Christ's Church, that we, the Dean and Chapter of the Cathedral Church of the Holy Trinity of Winchester, in accordance with authority granted to us by Her Most Gracious Majesty the Queen, dated the 28th day of January, 1891, and issued under the Great Seal, and harkening dutifully to the advice and recommendations herewith conveyed to us, have this day, after notice duly given and received, met in Chapter, and have with one heart and one voice elected to the Bishopric of Winchester, now vacant by the resignation of the Right Rev. Edward Harold Browne, formerly Bishop thereof, the Right Rev. Anthony Wilson Thorold, Doctor of Divinity, Bishop of Rochester, and we pray you to yield all due obedience to him as your spiritual pastor in God, and to remember him in your prayers, that he may receive grace and truth wisely to rule over this diocese to the glory of God and the eternal welfare of the souls of men now to be entrusted to his care.” The morning service was then concluded.

Now herein we behold what has been popularly regarded as an empty legal formality presenting itself in the beauty and energy of a living function.

Who has been at work ?

Anglicanism, fired with the love of historic continuity, has been breathing upon the bones. A more dry or dusty skeleton than the election process of an Anglican Bishop could hardly have fallen under the resurrective breath of the new ethos. Yet a generous effort has been made to transfuse the love of the past into the life of the present. The key to the process is to be found in the concluding paragraph :—

The proceedings at the election were conducted on exactly the same lines as those observed at the election of Bishop Waynflete in April, 1447, the Dean having taken particular pains in regard to the details.

As often as the Dean may thus endeavour, with reverent care, to re-enact the scenes of the historic past, his effort will be followed with interest, and certainly not least of all by those who believe that historic past to be religiously their own, and who have it in the midst of their hearts to "let England remember the days of old".

Only, one is tempted to wish that in doing so the Dean had been able to take the same care in reproducing the substantials as he has done in the details.

For instance.

Bishop Waynflete, whose election he has taken for a model, was appointed to the See of Winchester by Pope Nicholas V., whose Bulls of Provision to that effect are dated the 10th of May, 1447 (*Anglia Sacra*, i., 318; Le Neve's *Fasti Ecc. Ang.*, iii., 15).

Now that means a good deal.

It means that the Pope had received from the English proctors at Rome, and from the cardinals deputed to examine into the matter, satisfactory assurances as to the fitness of the candidate.

It means that, on a given day, the Pope, in public Consistory, solemnly pronounced an authoritative sentence by which he "by Apostolic Authority provided to the aforesaid Church of Winchester in the person of William Wainflete, appointing him thereto as its Bishop and its Pastor".

It means that the apostolic notaries taking down this Papal sentence—"words of the Pope," they called it—transferred it to parchment as the effective and operative clause which, interwoven with stately preamble and minor clauses, and all duly signed and laden with leaden seals made up the "Bulls of Provision". In these Bulls the couriers carried off the "Pope's words" to England, and upon the strength of them the candidate was consecrated and received possession of his see. It was in this form that Bishop Waynflete and the vast majority of English

Bishops for some two centuries before the Reformation were appointed.

In such Bulls of Provision the Popes were accustomed to add the phrase by which they "committed to the person appointed the full administration of the said Church both in spirituals and *in temporals*".

That the Pope rightfully bestowed the spirituals no one doubted or denied. But that he could convey "temporalities," which often included large estates held of the Crown, was quite another matter. In point of fact, that was not quite the meaning intended. However, the English Kings took umbrage at the phrase, and while they recognised the episcopal appointments made by the Pope, they took the precaution before granting the temporalities to require that the Bishop who received Bulls of Provision should renounce generally any clause therein prejudicial to the right of the Crown.

That the renunciation referred merely to the Pope's bestowal of temporalis, and not to his giving of the pastoral jurisdiction which was pre-eminently called spirituals, is made abundantly clear by the records of the time. One of the earliest instances of the renunciation made by an English Bishop was that which Edward I. exacted from William de Gainsborough, whom the Pope appointed and consecrated to the See of Worcester in 1303. The Bulls of Provision appointing Gainsborough contained the clause committing to him the "administration of the spirituals and temporalis" of the see. Whereupon the King, before releasing the temporalities, required the Bishop to renounce expressly all words in the Bull which were prejudicial to the Crown. To make the meaning of this renunciation clear, a memorandum was endorsed upon the Patent Roll issued for the livery of the temporalities, and may be seen at the Record Office to the present day. The following is a translation (the italics both here and below are mine):—

"Memorandum that on the same day, in the King's Palace at Windsor, on the presentment to the King of the Apostolic Bulls, in which, amongst other things, it was contained that the Pope had committed to him the administration of the *spirituals and temporalis*" [note the mention

of both] “of the aforesaid bishopric: insomuch as the said Bull seemed in this to be prejudicial to the right of the King, the aforesaid Bishop expressly renounced the said commission *in so far as concerned the temporalities*” [note the mention of temporalities only] “of the said bishopric (*præfata commissioni quantum ad temporalia, dicti episcopatus expresse renunciavit*). And for the offence which seemed to be done against the said King, by the admission of the Apostolic Bull, in which it was stated that the Pope had committed to him the administration of the *temporalities* of the said bishopric, the said Bishop was fined a thousand marks, to be paid to the said King when he willed, and after this the said Bishop made his fealty to the King” (Patent Roll, 31 Edward I., m. 39).

The same precaution was taken in 1337, when the Pope appointed by Bulls of Provision Thomas Hemenhale to the See of Worcester. This time the memorandum took the shape of a notarial schedule attached to the Bull. Its translation is as follows:—

“In the name of God, Amen.

“By the present public instrument be it known to all men that in the year of our Lord 1337, in the V. Indiction, in the third year of the Pontificate of Pope Benedict XII., on the 25th day of the month of July, the venerable Father Thomas, Bishop of Worcester, in the presence of the most excellent prince, the Lord Edward, King of England, etc., expressly renounced all words prejudicial to the said King, in the Bull of the Lord Pope as to the restitution of the *temporalities* to be made to him by the said King (*quoad restitutionem temporalium sibi faciendum per ipsum regem*). And he recognised that the said *temporalities* belonged to him only by the favour of the King aforesaid, and not by any other right. In the presence of John, Archbishop of Canterbury,” etc. (*vide Le Neve's Fasti*, iii., 57 n.).

Hence nothing could be more plain than that the renunciation had reference simply to the temporalities.¹ Bishop

¹ That Rome found nothing objectionable in the renunciation custom is proved from the fact that an English bishop made it by proxy while staying in Rome itself, and, so to speak, under the eyes of the Pope.

Grandisson made it "saving his profession in the Roman Court and the rights of the See Apostolic . . . submitting himself absolutely to the King's grace as to the *temporalities* of the see" (see *Register of Bishop Grandisson*, edited by Rev. Prebendary Hingeston-Randolph, Preface, ix.).

Although this reference to the renunciation of the temporalities is a matter of common knowledge to all students of English Church records, Dean Hook, in relating the making of this act by Archbishop Sudbury, actually asks his readers to believe that the Archbishop renounced the Pope's authority in spirituals, an act which every English prelate of that period would have repudiated as abominable schism and heresy.

The Royal objection was clearly directly against the obnoxious phrase concerning "temporalities". That it was not aimed against the act of Papal Provision itself is abundantly proved by the fact that the Kings themselves (and that for nearly two centuries after the Statute of Provisors) not only accepted the Papal Provisions, but, as a matter of fact, constantly asked for them (Stubbs' *Const. Hist.*, vol. iii., 325).

When the King restored the temporalities of the see to the Bishop provided and appointed by the Pope, the writ usually ran in this form:—

"The King to his Escheator in the County of X—greeting.

"Since our Lord the Sovereign Pontiff has appointed as Bishop and Pastor of the Cathedral Church of W— (lately vacant by the death of A. B. of holy memory) our sincerely beloved C. D., elect of the said Church, as it has been signified to Us by the Bulls of the said Lord Sovereign Pontiff to that end to Us directed.

"We,

"Seeing that the said person elected hath before Us openly and expressly made renunciation of each and every word prejudicial to Us and to our Crown contained in the said Bulls, and submitted himself to our clemency,

"Have received the Fealty of the said Elect, and according to custom have restored to him the temporalities of his bishopric.

“ Wherefore,

“ We command you that you deliver without delay, in the aforesaid form, saving all rights, the aforesaid temporalities with all their pertinences in your balliewick to the said Elect.”

(Numbers of such forms can be seen in vol. xiii. of Rymer's *Fœdera*.)

One can see from the tenor of the above that in the eyes of the English Chancery, not less than the Canon Law, the Papal Provision was recognised as the effective cause of the Bishop's appointment and was made the basis of the order for the release of the temporalities. Both the Royal petition and the Capitular election were most respectable forms of presentation. But legally and canonically it was to the authoritative words and Bulls of Pope Nicholas rather than to either that Bishop Waynflete owed his promotion to the See of Winchester.

A propos of the two recent Capitular elections noticed above there is another point which strikes one as singularly out of harmony with the olden time. Measured by the Canon Law which obtained in England for centuries before the Reformation, both are irregular. Neither Chapter had a right to “elect” a Bishop who belongs to another see, and such a process is not strictly an “election” at all. A Bishop already in possession of a diocese—such as Dr. Magee or Dr. Thorold—is by the very fact canonically a disqualified candidate. If a Chapter, despite the disqualification, wants to have him, they cannot *elect* him, they can only ask for him, or “*postulate*” him, so that the Church may loose him from the bond which still binds him to the see which he already possesses.

According to the ancient Canon Law of the English Church, such a severance could only be effected by the supreme authority of the Pope.

“For the resignation of Bishops,” says Lyndwood, the great Canonist of the English Church in the days of Henry VI., “is required the licence of the Pope. Thus, too, trans-

lations of Bishops cannot be made without the permission of the Pope and his authority" (*Provinciale C. de Poenis*).

Let us imagine that at the Reformation the authority of the Pope in England passed to the Primate and the King. The question suggests itself, Which of the two is it that severs Dr. Magee and Dr. Thorold from their dioceses, and sets them free to be elected by the Chapters of York and Winchester? It can hardly be the Primate, for he has not moved in the matter. Is it the Crown? If so, such a prerogative is divided by less than a shadow from the right of a King to depose a Bishop.

What would St. Basil, or St. John Chrysostom, or St. Athanasius have said to such a theory? It is so difficult to put the Pope out without letting Cæsar in!

Another substantial difference which marks off such elections from those which were held in Catholic times is the absolute annihilation of Capitular liberty. In its murder one can recognise the crushing thoroughness which marks the hand of Thomas Cromwell in the Tudor legislation. Since the Reformation the Dean and Chapter do not elect. They go through the form of an election. That is to say, the Crown in giving them power to "elect," not only singles out the person whom they are to elect, but requires them to elect that person and no other under the most terrible penalties of *præmunire*.

Yet it is well that the old forms should be preserved—the beautiful shadow of liberty!—even when nothing more than the form remains. Better still, perhaps, that such forms should be piously, prayerfully and reverently observed. If Anglicanism sits with the gyves of the Royal Supremacy on her wrists, who shall grudge her whatever solace she may derive from singing the songs which were heard in Sion?

In Catholic days Chapters were often wooed and won by the Kings, or overruled by the Pontiffs, but not the less Capitular independence was far from being a nullity.

When King Stephen, in 1142, sought to force the Chapter at York into electing his own nephew, William Fitzherbert,

a part of the Canons loudly protested. When the King over-rode their protests and had him consecrated, they, the Canons, appealed to Rome. Whereupon the Pope Eugenius III. quashed the election and deposed the Bishop. The sentence was: "By Apostolic Authority, We decree that William, Archbishop of York, is to be deposed from his bishopric on the grounds that Stephen, King of England, *nominated him before his canonical election*" (*Anglia Sacra*, i., 71).

Readers of the *Burton Annals* will remember how King John fought a battle royal with the Monastic Chapter of Coventry and failed to coerce them into electing the Abbot of Binnesdon to the See of Lichfield and Coventry, although his seneschal locked up the monks in Nottingham Castle, and swore "by the tongue of God" that they should not go out until they "had made a Bishop to the King's liking". Even when the King "rolled his eyes" and breathed threats and slaughter, and terrified the Prior at last into accepting another candidate, his hard-won victory came utterly to nothing, for Rome was at hand and calmly quashed the whole proceeding.

If ever the Dean should be disposed—were it only as a matter of antiquarian interest!—to revive the old Capitular practice of tilting with the Crown, he will find in the *Annals of Winchester* traditions of successful vindication of Capitular liberty far more substantial than the mere formalities of detail upon which he has centred his attention.

When Henry III., in 1238, tried to force a way for one of his candidates, the Chapter of Winchester kept the see vacant for four years, rather than consent to the Royal dictation.

Bishop Stubbs says of this reign: "The attempts of Henry III. to influence the Chapters were undignified and unsuccessful, his candidates were seldom chosen, and the Pope had a plentiful harvest of appeals" (*Const. Hist.*, iii., 315).

It is quite true that at a later period by virtue of a concordat or "concordia," as it was called, Bulls of Provision swept

over the heads of the Chapter, and left them but little to do or to say in the election of their Bishops. But even then the appointing Authority by which they were superseded was the supreme Spiritual one—not the Civil Power—and the Chapters were not humiliated by threats of *præmunire* into going through an empty rehearsal of an election. That expedient survives to us as a refinement of Tudor tyranny in the process of Church degradation. The insulting brutality of the statute of Henry VIII. which threatened a Diocesan Chapter with the punishment usually meted to felons unless it elects the Royal nominee, and then proceeds to threaten the Archbishop with the same fate, if within twenty days he fails to consecrate him, thoroughly deserves the description with which an Anglican Bishop indignantly gibbets it—“A Magna Charta of tyranny”.

Each time that an election is carried out under its authority, thoughtful and spiritual-minded Anglicanism may well ask itself if it has really gained so very much in the matter of Church dignity and liberty by the change of masters made at the Reformation.

CHAPTER XX.

Anglicanism and Monasticism and Penitential Works.

(21ST FEBRUARY, 1891.)

CAN the Monastic idea be sufficiently disguised to enable it to find its way into the citadel of the Establishment? For “monk” read “brother”—for “Religious Order” read “Brotherhood”—for “vow” read “engagement”.

Thus veiled, it bids fair to evade the scrutiny even of those who have done duty as the most vigilant of sentinels upon the watch-towers of Israel.

Thus *The Record*, which, as an Evangelical organ, might be supposed to offer to the whole scheme a strenuous opposition, is apparently soothed into tranquillity by the fact that the Bishops have substituted the word “engagements” for the Catholic term “vows”.

The Brotherhood question has at last been discussed by the Bishops in Canterbury Convocation, and the result will probably be regarded by most Churchmen as, on the whole, satisfactory. As usually happens, matters were considered with a moderation and an appreciation of surrounding circumstances which are often conspicuously absent from similar debates in other places. The Resolutions adopted by the Lower House, and rejected by the House of Laymen, have been varied by the omission of the word "vows" and the substitution of the word "engagements". This may mean much or may mean nothing.

The Record is half right. It practically means nothing. If Anglicanism has within it those who are fired with a love of the religious life and sincerely wish to give themselves to God, their vows will not be less vows because Convocation, in a mood of mincing, has called them "engagements". On the other hand, if the Anglican votaries are mere *dilettanti* who wish to play at monks as school-boys are wont to play at soldiers, the experiment will be pretty sure to work itself out, and the brothers, of their own accord, may be trusted to go through that not altogether unfamiliar process of changing "engagements" into vows, or doing with the engagements what people who are tired of a tie will sometimes do with it, even if the Bishops had ratified the monastic term in its most solemn and sacred acceptation.

A sign of the times and of the advancing tide may be found in the fact that even *The Record* recognises that a vocation to a monastic life and a celibate ministry is, after all, within the range of religious possibilities:—

Moreover, as we have ventured to point out again and again since the matter was first mooted, there is no reason whatever why societies of men should not be formed for work in the manner proposed. There is no more difficulty in accepting the services of an unmarried missionary than of an unmarried footman or housemaid. Special positions in life require special conditions, and as domestic service necessitates celibacy, so, it is said, does the work which the new societies of men are designed to discharge.

Again:—

As our Lord taught us, there are men—exceptional men—who are designed, so to speak, thus to serve God "for the kingdom of heaven's sake".

It is added that the above class is composed of only "a few rare souls," and that any effort "to bend thousands to this saintly type is like trying to make heroes wholesale".

To say that the religious life is not only possible but founded on our Lord's teaching, that it is a "saintly type," by which souls are raised to the "heroic" standard, are quite admissions enough to make in one day. No one will blame *The Record* if it has not within the purview of its experience any large numbers who are likely to fulfil its ideal. It is enough for us that it should even tardily admit the principle. If the writer should ever have leisure or inclination to look over the pages of the *Acta Sanctorum*, or pass a week in a Catholic monastery, he may be equally successful in finding the fulfilment.

The conversion of *The Record* on this important point—if we may fairly call it conversion—has, strange to say, been brought about by the Anglican Bishops:—

The Bishops of London and Rochester, the two Bishops of the Metropolis, agree that it "is simply impossible to do the work that has to be done without new modes of approaching the task," and they are further satisfied that the best means to be adopted is that of encouraging the formation of Brotherhoods, or societies of men living together and working under proper supervision, and subject to certain rules of service, to be approved in each case by the Bishop. We are bound to accept the testimony of the Bishops as to the needs of their dioceses, and it would be unwise lightly to refuse to them the means of coping with difficulties which their experience and reflection suggest.

The Catholic Church has occasionally had to cast her clerical and monastic nettles over the wall. Provincial platforms have trembled under the weight of their woe, and the eloquent defrocked have denounced to the echo, amid Protestant plaudits, the vows which they failed to keep and the system which they failed to live up to. There is something of the terrible irony of fate in the fact that their refutation, in so far, at least, as it affects the system and ideal, should come forth from the mouth of Protestant Bishops, and that such refutation should be voiced in tones of conviction and conversion by an approved organ of Evangelical Protestantism.

.

The double current of thought which enters into the whole fibre of Anglicanism—the Reformational and the philo-Catholic—the yes interwoven with the no—gives to its utterances a strangely perplexing effect. To wit, the following appears in the Bishop of Lichfield's Pastoral for Lent:—

Throughout the forty days we look onward to the mysteries of Gethsemane, of Calvary, and of the rocky tomb; that so, by all the discipline of the Lenten fast, and by all its added means of grace, we may be prepared to enter more deeply into the fellowship of Christ's sufferings, and be made conformable to His death. Now the way and means thereto is, first, to seek after that detachment and elevation of soul which will set us free to give our hearts and minds to the contemplation of these saving mysteries. This is the end of the discipline of Lent. And, secondly, to strive after that true penitence which will fit and prepare us to learn more clearly, and to our exceeding comfort, the power of the Precious Blood. First, then, we see that the discipline of Lent is not in itself an end, but a means to an end.

That, of course, is not the Bishop's discovery. Catholic theologians have taught for centuries that fasting is "meritorious" as a means, and is classed as "instrumental perfection". That such works done by God's grace, and thus operating through the merits of Christ, should merit grace here and reward hereafter is to a Catholic mind a matter of elementary Christianity. But here the Bishop gets into the Reformation current, and leaves us:—

There is no merit in our prayers, or fasting, or alms. If ever they should be looked upon simply as good deeds, as something to our credit, they would cease to be either profitable to ourselves or acceptable to God.

But almost immediately he comes back:—

But if by our longer or more frequent prayers we seek to rise into higher spiritual life, and into greater nearness to God; if in our fasting and abstinence we seek to subdue the flesh to the spirit, as the Church teaches us to pray; or to bring ourselves into subjection as St. Paul speaks; to have the mind more calm and clear for heavenly thought, through separation, as far as possible, from the temptations and distractions of the world; if by our alms we would both acknowledge our absolute dependence upon God, and learn to sit loose from our earthly possessions, while we cultivate a spirit of charity towards our fellowmen; then with such sacrifices God is well pleased, and by all these means we shall assuredly grow in grace and in the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour.

Here we have a mystery. All these means merit God's good pleasure, and procure "growth in grace" and knowledge of God—and yet they must not be "looked upon as good deeds," and they are not "meritorious"!

One naturally asks why should such unpleasant works be undertaken at all, if they are not meritorious? Possibly the perplexed might find some consolation in the thought that thus, at least, they might make some amends for past sins, and reparation for past indulgences.

But that is just what the Bishop—once more stepping over to the side of the Reformers—is careful to exclude:—

So, too, with our words and acts of penitence, our confessions of sins and our tears of sorrow, our self-searching and self-subduing—let all be done, not with the thought that we can make amends for our misdeeds, but that we may deepen in our hearts a sense of our utter unworthiness and of our need of Him who died for our sins.

How hard it is to weave the older beliefs of Protestantism with their Luther-like hatred of "good works" into the neo-Anglicanism that would revive the salutary practices of the olden time. There is a logical nexus between doctrine and discipline.

To stitch Luther's doctrine upon Catholic discipline must lead to the result which our Lord pointed out in the juncture of the old garment and the new.

When, as Catholics, we in common with the rest of the public are made the witnesses of the internal conflicts of Anglicanism, we owe it to truth and fairness to guard against surface impressions, and especially to see that no mere ungracious or uncharitable delight in the discord of an opposite camp should filter its way into our judgments. If the doctrinal distance between Liverpool and Lincoln seems to us a long one, and the chasm between High Church and Low Church a wide and a deep one, it behoves us not to allow our judgment of such differences (whilst guarding our Catholic appreciation of their significance) to go beyond the limits at which they are openly estimated and publicly avowed by Anglicans themselves. We shall be safe in accepting the testimony of witnesses from within. One such

witness speaks his mind in *The Record* with considerable candour. By "Our Church" he must be taken to mean the Established Church *quâ* Evangelical:—

Some of your correspondents do not seem clearly to understand the immense difference between the teaching of our Church and that of the Ritualists on this vital point. Our Church holds that in partaking the bread and wine the faithful partake of Christ's Body and Blood; the Ritualists hold that the bread and wine are actually and literally the Body and Blood of Christ. Between the two doctrines there is a gulf which no Eirenicon can bridge; peace can only be obtained, as it was at the Reformation, by the question being fought out. The one doctrine is Christian, the other pagan. Not that all Ritualists are pagans by any means—many of them are the earnest Christian gentlemen that Canon Smith has found them—but they have none the less adopted a pagan superstition, which is ruining, and will if not checked completely ruin our Church as far as its spiritual life is concerned, as it has ruined Rome. Already earnest-minded Ritualists are complaining that there is no spiritual life in their disciples.

The following passage is more philosophic, but hardly more hopeful:—

The Archbishop of Canterbury, blind to our real danger, softly assures us that there is no danger of Rome having any great following. Possibly not. Our real danger is not that a few from time to time leave us for Rome, but that our Church through the influence of the many who remain behind will become as corrupt as Rome. Whether Rome will then absorb us or not will in that case be a matter of indifference.

The following advice from another correspondent is somewhat more militant:—

As for your old-fashioned readers who are determined to support an appeal against the Lambeth Judgment, and not to give up a jot of Protestant truth for the sake of peace, I can only advise them to pray daily for a large supply of patience, courage and wisdom; for they may depend on it, times are coming when they will need it. We are every year getting nearer to a practical toleration of the Mass, auricular confession, incense, crucifixes, prayers for the dead, prayer to the Virgin Mary, and the whole sacerdotal system in the Church of England. Churchmen who do not approve these novelties must contend earnestly for the faith. "He that hath no sword, let him sell his garment and buy one."

It would, of course, be utterly inconceivable that so much naughtiness could be wrought if the Jesuits were not at the

bottom of it. The chairman at a recent meeting of the Church Association felt it a duty to trace the evil to its unvarying source:—

Surely the time had come when they should present an undivided front against the enemy. It was no longer a question of candles and vestments, but of whether England should be Catholic or Protestant, whether it should be enslaved or whether it should be free. Behind it all was Jesuitism of the Church of Rome. There was vast conspiracy going on in this country to enslave us, and he was sorry to say that it came from the highest people in the realm, and that Jesuitism, which had caused more mischief in the world than any other influence, was at the bottom of it.

The speaker's views on Jesuitism may be allowed to pass as a time-honoured formula, but his frank statement that the issue is radically one of Catholic doctrine *v.* Protestantism is indisputable. If he could prove to us that the country is undergoing a process of doctrinal absorption in the direction of Catholicity—and there is undoubtedly much to support his contention—we should be quite content to trust to the natural and necessary sequence of things that organic absorption would sooner or later be sure to follow.

CHAPTER XXI,

Anglicanism in America—How the Reformation is being found out.

(14TH MARCH, 1891.)

ANGLICANISM in America has had also its *cause célèbre*.

But there is a whole Atlantic of differences between it and the case of Lambeth *versus* Lincoln.

The person arraigned is not a Bishop but an Anglican clergyman named the Rev. Howard MacQueary. The offence is not an excess of doctrine or ritual, or what Lord Grimthorpe contemptuously described as an "ablution business". It is a case of defection and denial. Authority has had to be invoked, not to repress a Bishop who is advancing too fast, but to take cognisance of a cleric who has turned his back upon the standards of faith and is marching apace in the opposite direction,

The two great ecclesiastical trials are significantly different, and possibly they may be taken as the ripple and swirl which mark the varying force and flow of religious thought in the two countries.

But who is Mr. MacQueary?

He is the Anglican—or to use the American designation—the Protestant Episcopal clergyman at Canton, Ohio.

At first sight one would say that the uneasy spirit of Robert Elsmere had grown weary of his apotheosis between the covers of Mrs. Humphrey Ward's novel, and wandered across the ocean to take concrete shape and action in the person of the Rev. Howard MacQueary. In the latter we have, as a basis of analogy, a man holding a place in the Anglican ministry in whom has been wrought a change of mind resulting in a change of religious position. There was no wicked old Squire with a terrible manuscript *magnum opus* under his arm to say presto! and with fairy-like magic to work a destructive charm upon the foundations of faith. Possibly such "business" is too dramatic for the practical public of America. In Mr. MacQueary's case, the wizard was the rather sensible and commonplace one of "a course of reading of modern writers on evolution". However, the result seems to have been just as complete as if he had edited the Squire's portentous manuscript.

So they have put to him the old question of which the world never grows weary: "What think ye of Christ?"

He holds that Christ had man for His father.

He denies the virginity of the Blessed Virgin ("Its authorship," he says, "is too uncertain to allow of its acceptance").

His theory of the Incarnation is, that Christ "was as much of the Divine Spirit as could be forced, so to speak, into a human form".

He denies a real or corporal resurrection.

He is willing to admit a kind of "miraculous conception," but holds that "it occurred along the line of natural generation, and not in contradiction of the laws of life which God had ordained".

The reader may perhaps feel that that is quite heresy enough for one paragraph.

Mr. MacQueary has taken care to put his religious position, not merely before his people, but before the public. He embodied it in a work which he has written for the purpose. He is also said—(an American *on dit* is perhaps not much more reliable than a European one)—to have assured an interviewer that he had made the calculation that it would require “at least two centuries for the Christian Church in America to reach the point of progress at which he himself now stands”.

When Robert Elsmere felt that his faith had ceased to be that of his Church, he hastened to place his resignation in the hands of his Bishop. It is at this point that American strenuousness comes to the rescue of Mr. MacQueary. He does not resign. He does not recant. He does not evade the test of public examination. He desires it. He claims a fair trial and a full inquiry.

His position as stated by *The New York Sun* is as follows:—

It will be seen that Mr. MacQueary is unalterable in his determination to remain in Holy Orders, unless and until he is deposed in the regular order of ecclesiastical procedure. He is no less decided in his refusal to recant any of the views which he has expressed and for which he is denounced as a heretic. He contends that he has not violated the fundamental principles and teachings of the Church, and insists on his right to defend his position before an ecclesiastical tribunal. He will make no compromise, will abandon nothing for the sake of conciliation, and is ready to stand by the consequences of his words, whatever they may be.

The authorities of the Anglican Church in America felt it to be a duty to deal with him. It is more than inconvenient when a preacher who avowedly belongs to the twenty-first century occupies a pulpit at the close of the nineteenth. It is possible to be too far ahead, even in America! He received a communication from the Bishop of Ohio. The intervention was long in coming, and was timidly made when it did come. Mr. MacQueary was given to understand

that he must retract or modify his opinions in a second edition of his work, and to abstain from such utterances in his future pulpit ministrations. In other words, he was to come right back from the twenty-first century.

Mr. MacQueary declined. When the Bishop suggested retirement as a plain solution of the difficulty, the proposal was peremptorily dismissed as utterly out of the question. To threaten legal proceedings was equally unavailing. Such a trial has no terrors and many charms for the defendant. He was far more anxious to be brought to the bar than his superiors were to arraign him.

The trial took place on 7th January. Apparently it was conducted upon legal and Anglican as distinguished from Catholic or Canonical lines. The prosecutor is credited with having stated the intervention of the authorities in the following terms :—

“We are not here to inquire whether Mr. MacQueary is teaching the truth, or whether the doctrines of the Church are erroneous. We are here to inquire whether Mr. MacQueary is teaching what the Church says he must teach while he remains a clergyman.”

Such a procedure is the reduction of an ecclesiastical trial to a basis of contract. It is the ground upon which a shoemaker's apprentice might have been tried for a breach of his articles.

In the meantime it is worthy of note that Mr. MacQueary has formulated his doctrines, not by rejecting but retaining the Bible, and applying to it, in the light of modern thought, that principle of private interpretation which, as a Protestant, he conceives it to be his privilege to possess.

The results of his interpretation are a cruel commentary upon the principle.

What his Bishop does with the Petrine texts he does with the Messianic. The Anglican forms his own idea of the Church. Mr. MacQueary forms his own idea of Christ. The Anglican puts aside the General Councils of the Vatican, Trent and the Lateran. Mr. MacQueary continues the stroke and puts aside Nicæa. Both have rejected the living

Voice of the Christ-sent teacher, the Infallible Church, and between them there is a distance not of principle but of progress. After all, if the Anglican fashions for himself his own interpretation of the Scriptures and the Fathers, and calls it the "interpretation of the Church" because he himself has first of all formed his own conception of what is meant by the "Church"—what is it but private interpretation upon the *wholesale* principle, and the results, much more Christian as we joyfully recognise them to be, stand not the less on the same logical level as the Arianisms of Mr. MacQueary.

For the sake of Anglicanism in America, and for the stand which we gladly behold it to make against the lowest types of Protestantism, we may hope that the MacQueary trial represents an isolated and quite exceptional instance of doctrinal infidelity. We should be glad to think so, but on this side of the Atlantic we cannot pretend to say, but can only pray that it may be so. Americans may be trusted to know their own country best. Their verdict on the above point, if we may judge from their press, is not in the direction of our aspirations. *The New York Sun* says:—

It is undoubtedly the case, also, that the difference between him and many others in the orthodox ministry is not so much in their religious views and opinions as in the courage to declare and maintain them. Unexpressed and downright scepticism exists among clergymen whose outward conformity saves them from suspicion. Mr. MacQueary speaks out his doubt and denial to all the world.

The effect upon those who have already lapsed or lapsing into the ranks of scepticism and free-thought may be readily conjectured. We may gauge it in some measure from the following passage, in which a non-Christian writer in *The Twentieth Century* sums up the position:—

The fact is, that men like Howard MacQueary, and Lyman Abbott, and Herbert Newton, and Professor Briggs are just plain, old-fashioned infidels. They are clinging to old words and old associations, trying to put new wine into old bottles; but if the Church had the nerve it once had, and if there were not so many other infidels in the Church, these men could not remain in their respective denominations a month.

Father Ignatius is right. He said last Sunday that these men are infidels, and that the Church ought to put them out, and must put them out unless she wishes to be destroyed. But the fact is that the Church is so honey-combed with infidelity that approaches atheism that she dreads the agitation which the trial of these heretics must create.

I have said that I believe men like MacQueary, and Newton, and Abbott—and there are hundreds of them unknown to the public, because they keep their thoughts to themselves—are entirely out of place in the Church. I do not mean to impugn their motives in remaining there. They are trying to liberalise the Church. They think they will have more influence for good in their positions in the Church than if they were to withdraw.

If such an estimate were even partially true, it would point to the conclusion that Protestantism in the United States is in an advanced stage of disintegration.

There are already 140 sects in the United States, and their number is yearly increasing. With such a principle of corrosion at work one would suppose that the goal of Protestant progress in America would be a state of things in which every man would be his own Church, and denominations would finally resolve themselves into the primary element of the individual.

An American preacher, the Rev. M. J. Savage, calmly accepts the outlook in all seriousness. He says:—

It has been the scorn and scoff at Protestantism that it has been broken into a thousand sects, and the Roman Church points to-day with pride to her great union, and with mockery to the dissipation of Protestantism, yet this is Protestantism's crowning glory.

Suppose it does disintegrate till there be a sect for every man and woman; to what is it leading? That each one may go his own way toward truth and God.

What are we coming to? To a unification of belief in everything that can be demonstrated as true.

We are going to have a creed of demonstrated truth, accepted by all competent men, and that creed will grow as fast as truth itself grows.

On the basis of that creed we are going to look into the world and the future in a spirit which is the tolerance of wisdom.

It is a far cry from such depths of disbelief and dependency to the heights of Anglicanism, as shown forth in *The Catholic Champion* and in the Catechism of Trinity

Church, New York. Anglicanism of the brighter and better kind, in America as in England, has its perils and its anxieties. Even if it burns our candles, wears our vestments, and copies our formularies, who will not watch its movement with prayers that it may be crowned with an ulterior success, other and better and higher than even itself would consent to pray for.

Alas for those who would fight the battle of the Lord outside the walls of His citadel!

American Anglicanism has been upon its trial in the case of Mr. MacQueary.

The most notable feature in the case was the noon-day plainness of Mr. MacQueary's heresy. ("Plain as the nose upon his face" was the rather personal simile which one of the Anglican Church writers used to describe it.)

He had publicly denied the Divinity of Christ as Christians understand it. He had taught that Christ was a man conceived and born of human parents like other men. He had, moreover, denied the physical Resurrection of Christ.

The outcome of his doctrine was to teach that Christ was a mere man, divinised by the Spirit of God as far as any pure creature is capable of such a process.

People asked:—

Is it possible that the Anglican Church in America can allow such open infidelity to be taught in its name and from its pulpits?

The question has been answered.

The Anglican Bishop of Ohio constituted a Court composed of the five leading clergymen of his diocese, and gave them a commission to try Mr. MacQueary.

After three long and laborious sessions the Court has recorded its verdict. Mr. MacQueary has been condemned, three of his judges voting against him, while two pleaded earnestly in his favour.

Thus belief in the Divinity of Christ was affirmed—by a majority of one!

The Creed of Nicæa has had some stirring experiences. Perhaps its narrowest escape was in the Anglican Court in Ohio.

The New York Sun appreciates very fairly the gravity of the issue :—

In denying the virgin birth of Jesus, and declaring that the Incarnation was along the lines of natural generation, with Joseph as His father, Mr. MacQueary took away the Divine character of the Son of God. He made of Him a mere man inspired by the Divine Spirit, as any other man might be inspired. He reduced Him from a proper object of worship as God to a simple prophet among men ; a teacher of profound and heavenly wisdom, and an exemplar for all mankind, but not the Second Person of the Trinity. Hence his teaching shattered and removed the very corner-stone of Christianity and the Church. If Jesus is not God, very God of very God, and of one substance with the Father, Christian theology rests on fiction and superstition, and not on eternal and unchangeable truth: it ranks with pagan mythology as a creation of men and not of God.

The question which is of real importance to Anglicanism is not what may be done in the individual case of Mr. MacQueary, but whether this narrow three-to-two division really represents or reveals the state of religious opinion amongst American Anglicans upon his teaching.

The New York Sun views the matter with some apprehension :—

Moreover, of the Court of five before whom Mr. MacQueary was tried, two clergymen voted for his acquittal, as against the three who brought about his conviction. In the view of this minority, therefore, it is possible for a clergyman of the Episcopal Church to deny the doctrine of the Incarnation, which lies at the basis of Christian belief, and yet remain unaffected in his standing in the Church. It may be that the division of this Cleveland Court, or three-to-two, represents the division which exists among the Episcopal clergy as a whole, touching the vital question at issue.

And again :—

Yet at this time the authority of the Bible as Divine revelation is rejected or explained away by a large and important part of the clergy. Poor Mr. MacQueary is made a victim simply because he has followed his preceptors, speaking out, perhaps, more frankly than they the conclusions to which both they and he have come.

The New York Tribune sees the decision in very much the same light :—

Such a verdict is in every way unsatisfactory. For it is a distinct declaration, not only that the accused clergyman is guilty

of denying certain articles of the Church's Creed, but that there are others in the Church who uphold him in his position. The latter point is the one in which the Episcopal Church is most seriously concerned. The fate of Mr. MacQueary is of comparatively little consequence, except to himself, and he is doubtless prepared to abide by the consequences of his utterances. But that two out of five orthodox clergymen in such a staid conservative diocese as Ohio should deliberately conclude that an Episcopal clergyman may deny the virgin birth and the physical Resurrection of Christ without being called in question therefor is a serious matter.

To Catholics it is a truism that the rejection of the Church's Divine Authority, and the principle of private judgment, whether exercised by the individual for himself or collectively by a sect for its members, eventually makes for the unsettlement of belief in even the most fundamental dogmas of Christianity.

According to *The Tribune* American Anglicanism is finding it out:—

If the minority of the Court expresses the attitude of any considerable number of clergymen throughout the Church—and there is reason to believe that it does—it indicates an unsettled state of mind in the Church in regard to some of its fundamental doctrines. And the question will arise whether it is just to condemn Mr. MacQueary for expressing an opinion on questions which are not settled, and which cannot be settled. For there is no general Court of Appeal in the Episcopal Church; and consequently no way of getting a decision from the Church itself on the questions at issue in this trial.

The diocese of Ohio, it is true, has spoken by a bare majority of its Court. But the Protestant Episcopal Church has never empowered the diocese of Ohio to decide for it in matters of doctrine, discipline or worship. It was unfortunate for the Episcopal Church, even more than for Mr. MacQueary, that this trial ever took place; and its outcome is still more unfortunate.

The Boston Herald grasps the issue with characteristic breadth. It does not believe in the infallibility of the odd man:—

Two of his judges are for deposition and two for acquittal, and the fifth sits on the fence, or, rather, would make Mr. MacQueary take that position and destroy his usefulness in the Episcopal Church. The verdict of the Court whose inside hand is thus made public

cannot have much weight in a case of heresy. It is a judgment in which no advance is made for either party. It leaves things where they were before.

That a man who professes to be a Christian minister should deny the Divinity of Christ, and yet not be considered as an unbeliever, is rather an ominous sign of the tone and fibre of Bostonian Christianity.

The following passage of the above-mentioned organ presents, we think, a fair picture of Protestantism worked out to its logical conclusions. It is a cruel commentary upon the comprehensiveness of the Anglican Creed and Articles:—

Nobody has said that Mr. MacQueary had not violated the ordinary and traditional interpretation of the Episcopal Creed and formularies, or that by a strict construction of these documents he should not be censured. The point in his defence was that he had been faithful to the spirit of the Creed and the Articles, according to an allowable, if not universal, interpretation, and that a considerable portion of the clergy and laity of the Episcopal Church, if they did not reject the virgin birth of our Lord and His bodily Resurrection, did not regard either of these doctrines as of vital importance to the faith. The truer statement would be that they put the stress of their belief upon the whole active career of Christ, and regard it as a Divine manifestation in man, without feeling certain that the virgin birth fully explains His coming into the world or the bodily Resurrection His passage out of it. They do not feel so certain on these points as the definite statements of the Creed and the Articles would imply, but they would not for a moment wish to be classed with unbelievers or agnostics. Mr. MacQueary is naturally affiliated with these persons, and the whole company have felt they had a fair and honest standing room in the Episcopal Church.

It concludes:—

The result of the trial is apparently an indorsement of the wholesome liberty and comprehensiveness which this communion has come to stand for in this country.

We ask ourselves the question:—

Are these the men and this the Church with which reverent and Christ-adoring Anglicans in this country claim to be in communion and fellowship of faith?

Mr. MacQueary may be cast out, but what becomes of the two clerical judges who openly advocated his acquittal, and

what of the influential following which they represented and voiced in such an advocacy? Will they remain to take part in the next Pan-Anglican Synod?

This set of facts, taken as a whole, puts under our eyes an object-lesson on the value of the Anglican Theory.

They show how it bends and breaks down under the test of practical working.

Unless these American journals belie the state of religion in their own country, the Anglican Theory of the Church is powerless to preserve orthodoxy, or the very fundamentals and essentials of Christian faith even as Anglicans understand it.

In America itself these facts seem to have brought home to thoughtful Anglicans the need of the principle of Church Authority, without which all attempts to preserve Christian faith are foredoomed to be hopeless.

Thus Dr. Morgan Dix, whose Lenten Lectures appear in a Chicago weekly, while pleading for the Anglican conception of the Church, allows us to see how far these impressions are borne in upon him by recent events:—

Authority is implied throughout the entire system. The Bible constitutes an authoritative revelation to all nations, and the Church has authority to settle its sense. The Creed is an authority; the Sacraments are necessary to salvation. The ministry have authority, conferred not by the people, but by the successors of the Apostles. Take away this principle, and the entire fabric is wrecked. For example, if men are free to give to the Church what form of government they will, the authority of the minister will then rest, not on Divine prescription, but on the good sense and discretion of men. If the Bible be not an authoritative revelation, it becomes a book like any other book. If the Sacraments be not of authority, we have no right to say that they are necessary. If the Creeds be not of authority, men may at pleasure modify, correct, amend, or throw them aside.

Thus, by the simple process of rejecting the principle of authority, the Church becomes a human institution; the ministry a profession like any other; the Bible a book like any other book. The results of the rejection of this principle are not reached at once, but by degrees; and it is to be feared that the drift at present is towards that position.

Dr. Dix omits to tell us where he finds the authority which is to settle the *sense* of the Scriptures and the Creeds

to the friends of Mr. MacQueary. Silent books and formulas which do not fix their own interpretation can never be that which living minds mean and need when they cry out for Church Authority.

Dr. Dix continues:—

The present disorganised state of Christianity is the natural result of the rejection of the principle of authority. Recovery of unity depends on the reinstatement of that principle. Such results are not reached *per saltum*: they came forth slowly on the view; but we have them all too distinctly before us this hour, and God knows how far the mischief is destined to spread. There is, no doubt, considerable difference in the rate of the drift, and in the points attained thus far. There are conservative denominations, and in them are strong and brave men; there are devout and godly people, whom we believe to be with us in our thoughts and hopes in the main: but who is safe when once he admits that the Church is a society like any other institution, that the ministry is a profession like any other profession, and that the Bible is a book like any other book?

How truly men are finding out for themselves the mischief that lies at the root of the Reformation!

While such earnest words born of saddening experiences are being written at Chicago, a voice comes from Cornwall, here at home, to say that there, too, in quite another way, the Reformation is being found out in the wrong.

A correspondent of *The Church Review*, writing upon the celibacy of the clergy, says:—

“A Married Priest” speaks very strongly on the subject of celibacy. I venture to think we require something more in the Church of to-day if we are to win souls back from scepticism and schism. In our Truro diocese the logical outcome of Wesley’s movement has been to spread heresy, schism and immorality throughout the length and breadth of the country. People will tell you they “follow” the chapel or the Church. Alas! it is at a great distance. They never seem to get there, or very rarely. Where is the remedy? Zeal, more zeal. What we require is not celibacy alone. There must be three knots in the girdle, not *one* only. Obedience too, and above all poverty, is what we need. Oh! for a Franciscan Order in our Church of England, to go around in cassock and scapular bareheaded, preaching by the roadside and in the villages as well as in the church itself, taking no money save a

railway fare, having no possessions, no clothes save what they wear, lifting up the crucifix and uncompromisingly proclaiming the way of salvation through the Holy Church.

Then he asks a very pertinent question, only to frankly and fully answer it:—

Why is it we do not possess such men? Surely, surely, not because there are none devoted enough to make the great renunciation. No, sir, it is because so few Bishops would tolerate such of us as might feel so called.

Who can witness all this yearning for the voice of Her who, like Her Founder, "Speaketh with authority," and for the agencies of self-sacrifice which she alone can aspire, without praying that blessings of light may descend upon the truth-seekers, and that the failure of systems that are human may be their lesson to find and to recognise the one that is Divine.

CHAPTER XXII.

An Anglican Enthronement—Continuity by Contrasts.

(28TH MARCH, 1891.)

CAN we conceive a theory of Church continuity based upon contrasts?

On the 17th inst. Dr. Magee was enthroned as Archbishop of York. The Protestant Bishop of Derry preached upon the occasion. To say that the sermon was ablaze throughout with Celtic brilliance and eloquence is only to say that it was Dr. Alexander who preached it.

The preacher took his stand before his English audience "as the representative of the Church of St. Patrick". He reminded his hearers that "fifty years after the death of St. Patrick, St. Columba was born in the diocese of Raphoe, a Saint far more thoroughly Irish than St. Patrick". From St. Columba and Iona there was only a short step to Aidan and Lindisfarne, and then one more to St. Chad and the See of York. Consequently, he was able to drive up to the goal in the following terms:—

"In the year '665 St. Chad was consecrated Bishop of

York and Lichfield.¹ As a youth Chad was drawn under the influence of Aidan of Lindisfarne. Once more on this great day we have living and breathing before us the Celtic, Roman and English elements all represented before us."

Thus he led up to his first point on which he had congratulated an Irish Archbishop upon his promotion to the "ancient and sacred chair of the Archiepiscopate of York".

We leave the eloquence of the sermon to stand upon its own merits. We are only concerned with the facts.

In the passages cited the preacher has clearly interwoven five persons. They are, St. Patrick, St. Columba, St. Chad, Dr. Magee and Dr. Alexander.

The first three are founders of Celtic and Northumbrian Christianity. The remaining two—Dr. Magee and Dr. Alexander—are "their successors" and "representatives".

Dr. Alexander is the "representative of the Church of St. Patrick" (and that of St. Columba, who was born in his own diocese, and "was more thoroughly Irish than St. Patrick"). And as for Dr. Magee, he sits "in the sacred and ancient chair" of St. Chad.

We place them, therefore, in two rows—the three ancient founders and their two modern representatives, and set them face to face.

Comparisons are generally odious, but here comparison is courted and invoked by at least one of the group to be compared, and thus we are encouraged to make it, and to put into words some of the more palpable contrasts which arise from the making of it.

Looking upon the two rows as they stand—the ancient group in their monastic habits, and the modern group in their lawn sleeves—there is no need to formulate the differences which would at once appeal to the spectator who views them from within the fold of the Church. He would see

¹ A case of preacher's licence. In 665 St. Chad was consecrated Bishop, not of York and Lichfield, but of York. From this see he was deposed by Archbishop Theodore (who was "appointed by the Apostolic See"), and was later on by him made Bishop at Lichfield. There were at least three years between his consecration to York and his subsequent appointment to Lichfield.

between the feet of the opposite groups the abysmal chasm which separates what is Catholic from all that is not Catholic. He would recognise the difference between them as all that trenchant and eternal one which lies between those who have the priesthood and mission of Christ, and those who are bereft of both. To him the Church-made bishops would stand on one side, and the King-made bishops on the other. The Canonical substance would be confronted by the legal shadow. The Catholic, moreover, in the conscientious conviction of his position, would feel all that security which comes from the knowledge that, in holding it, he has the authority of the Church, and the immovable weight and overwhelming majority of the Christian world behind him.

So much for the inside view. But let us take a few of the contrasts which may be fairly expected to make themselves visible even to outsiders.

Let us begin with the state of life.

The glory of the Irish Church was St. Columba, who was "more thoroughly Irish than St. Patrick". He, like St. Patrick, was a monk and the founder of monasteries. It was his monastery of Iona that was the training school of St. Aidan and the Lindisfarne missionaries.

St. Columba's life and a charmingly graphic account of his work in Iona are given us by Adamnan, his successor, who was born about thirty years after Columba's death, and gathered from the community at Iona the still fresh traditions of their founder. The work was written within twenty years of the consecration of St. Chad, to which Dr. Alexander referred. This biography is most ably edited by Dr. Reeves, Protestant Bishop of Limerick. In his introduction Dr. Reeves gives a careful summary of the mode of life at Iona based upon the actual text of Adamnan.

Speaking of Obedience he says: "The *obedientia sine mora*"—(instant obedience)—"of the Benedictine Rule was evidenced in Hy (Iona) by the alacrity with which the Abbot's orders were executed". Of Poverty he says: "The brethren had all things common. Personal property was disclaimed." Of Chastity he says: "There can be no doubt that celibacy was strictly enjoined on his (Columba's)

community, and the condition, *Virgo corpore et Virgo mente*, held up for imitation”.

But all this under what sanction? Dr. Reeves continues (p. cxiii.):—

“Whenever any one desired admission to the Order the application was submitted to the Abbot, to whom it was discretionary to receive into communion immediately, or extend the probation over as long a period as seven years. At the appointed time the candidate was conducted to the Oratory, where on his knees he repeated after the Abbot the *monachicum votum*” (the monastic vow), the solemn asseveration being *per nomen Excelsi Dei* (“By the name of the Most High God”).

Here we have in plain terms the monastic life and the monastic vows.

May we expect that Dr. Alexander in Derry, and Dr. Magee in York will advocate or institute this principle in their respective dioceses?

After all, between men who live in their monastic cells bound by vows of poverty, chastity and obedience, and men who live in palaces with their wives and families, there is an appreciable difference. It is contrast number one.

St. Columba is described in this Life as “celebrating the Solemn Mass” (139, 201, 206). The Mass is spoken of as the “Sacred Mysteries” (202, 206), or “the Mysteries of the Sacred Oblation” (139). The priest is represented as “standing before the altar” to “consecrate the Sacred Mysteries of the Eucharist,” or “to consecrate the Sacred Oblation” (206), or “to make the Body of Christ” (*Christi Corpus Conficere*) (142), and a Divine light is described as descending upon the head of Columba all the time that he was engaged in the “same most Sacred Mysteries” (206).

Are these the terms that Dr. Alexander and Dr. Magee employ—and underneath the terms, are these the beliefs which they inculcate—when they teach their clergy and people the meaning of Holy Eucharist?

May we hazard a solution in the fact that it is a commonplace of history that the Reformation, to which both the prelates owe their position, vehemently repudiated both the

terms and the doctrine of the Sacrifice of the Mass which the account of Iona so plainly conveys. Both these prelates themselves have signed the Reformation Articles in which "Sacrifices of Masses" are denounced as "blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits" (Art. xxxi.).

And yet they are the representatives of the missionaries of Iona! That is contrast number two.

In chapter xiii., book iii., we read that St. Columba one day ordered his monks to prepare all things for "celebrating the Holy Sacrifice" and the "Mysteries of the Holy Eucharist". But when during the offices they sang the prayer of St. Martin, "the Saint suddenly turning to the chanters when they had made mention of that name, said, 'You must pray to-day for St. Columban'. Then all the brethren present understood that Columban, a Bishop in Leinster, a dear friend of Columba, had passed to the Lord."

Now if Columba believed that his friend was already in Heaven, he could not have asked the monks to pray *for* him, for souls in Heaven have no need of anything. Nor could he have believed that his friend was in Hell, as in that case he would have been past praying for. Hence, he must have believed in a middle state in which souls are detained for a time, and in which they are helped by our prayers, and especially by the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass. In other words, he believed in Purgatory.

Was it not Dr. Magee who gave one of his clergymen four reasons why the Eucharist should not be offered for a deceased divine?

I quote from *The Yorkshire Post* :—

He, however, said that we could not give the Church of Rome so great a help in controversy as to identify her doctrine of Purgatory and Masses for the dead with the doctrine of the early Churches as to the intermediate state, and the primitive commemoration of the Eucharist of the faithful departed. The matter that brought the question before his Lordship was a notice given by the Rev. James Mason, of St. Paul's, Leicester, that the Holy Communion would be celebrated for the repose of the soul of Dr. Pusey, and whilst defending Mr. Mason from a charge of being a Romanist, in consequence of such action on his part, he showed his statesmanlike temper by expressing his disapproval of the giving of the notice in question, and stated four reasons for that course, namely, (1) that

it was inexpedient; (2) that it amounted to an attempt to revive a practice which, doubtless for good and sufficient reasons, the Church has disused; (3) that such an addition to the rubrical notice was illegal; and (4) liable to give offence to parishioners ignorant of the distinction between Roman and primitive practice. Dr. Magee's method of dealing with this case is a good example of his tact, and an augury of good import as to his coming archiepiscopal work.

Whatever be Dr. Magee's views on the "primitive practice," his practice has thus been to forbid ostentatiously the Eucharist to be offered for the dead. St. Columba commanded it to be so offered. That is contrast number three.

In chapter xl., book ii., we read that Columba received Libran, a penitent, who "confessed all his sins and promised kneeling upon the ground to fulfil the laws of penance," and that the Saint required him to do penance for "seven years".

In chapter x., book i., we read as follows:—

"This Colca residing at one time in the Iouan Island (Hy now Iona) with the Saint, was asked by him concerning his mother whether she was a pious woman." Colca answered him: "I have always known my mother to be good and to bear that character".

The Saint then spoke these prophetic words:—

"Set out now at once for Scotia (Ireland) with God's help, and question thy mother closely regarding her very grievous sin which she will confess to no man."

To carry out the advice thus given to him, he departed to Hibernia, and when he interrogated his mother closely, she at first denied, and then she at last confessed her sin. When she had done penance according to the judgment of the Saint, she was absolved, wondering very much all the while at what was made known to the Saint concerning her.

Here we have St. Columba inculcating the necessity of confession (to man) and absolution of secret sins.

How do Dr. Alexander or Dr. Magee teach or practise the doctrine of confession and absolution? Their answer will furnish us with contrast number four.

In his introduction to his edition of the *Book of Armagh* (Roll Series), Mr. Whitley Stokes sees no grounds for dis-

believing the historical evidence that St. Patrick received his commission from Pope Celestine. He was the disciple of St. Germanus, who certainly acted, as Prosper tells us, as Vicar of the Pope (*vice sua*) in the mission against Pelagianism in Britain.

An ancient Canon which is ascribed to St. Patrick, and which, at the least, voices the earliest traditions of the Irish Church, is as follows:—

“Moreover, if any case should arise of extreme difficulty, and beyond all the knowledge of the Judges of the nation of the Scots, it is to be duly referred to the Chair of the Archbishop of the Irish, namely, of St. Patrick, and the jurisdiction of the Bishop (of Armagh).

“But if such a case as aforesaid of a matter at issue cannot be easily disposed of (by him) with his counsellors therein, we have decreed that it be sent to the Apostolic See, namely, to the Chair of the Apostle Peter, having the authority of the City of Rome” (O’Curry, *MSS. Materials*, 612).

We have seen that when Theodore, in 668, was chosen and consecrated by Pope Vitalian to be Archbishop of Canterbury, he made a visitation of the whole country, re-organising the sees and everywhere establishing the Roman customs and the Roman Easter. In the Council of Hertford he declared his authority in the words: “I, Theodore, although unworthy, appointed by the Apostolic See, Bishop of the Church of Canterbury”. At his word St. Chad resigned his See of York. At his word he gave up the Celtic and adopted the new Roman Easter. Finally, at his word St. Chad came forth from his monastery and was appointed to the See of Lichfield. His predecessor in the See of York, after whom the Chair of York is correctly called, was St. Paulinus, who was sent and appointed by Pope Gregory the Great.

All these facts and testimonies to us mean Roman jurisdiction. Dr. Alexander and Dr. Magee owe their *locus standi* to the very repudiation of what these founders of our Christianity acknowledged and made the basis of their mission. They have taken an oath that they hold their

bishoprics of the Crown, and have subscribed a declaration that the Pope "hath no jurisdiction in this realm of England". That is contrast number five.

It is over this five-fold contrast that the Bishop of Derry has built his scheme of continuity. Truly a marvellous *tour de force* in the matter of oratory!

Readers who in their younger days have read certain chapters of writers like Macaulay, and in riper years have had to correct their impressions by the study of later and more scientific historians, will probably carry with them to their grave a distrust of rhetoric as applied to history.

If we conclude that the nota of the Bishop's sermon was rhetorical in contradistinction to historical, we shall have found the only solution to our question how Church continuity could be based on contrasts, and we may dismiss our groups, the monks to their graves and the Anglican bishops to the posts of distinction and influence to which their system has deservedly called them.

CHAPTER XXIII.

Passion Services in England—Who Wins?

(4TH APRIL, 1891.)

ANGLICANISM of the higher kind is movement.

It represents a reaction of the English mind. It is the return-journey from the Reformation towards the Catholic Church. We may believe that both religiously and historically it is England on her way home. True, all are not coming. But of those of this generation who seek the face of God, the most earnest are afoot and astir. True, as yet we behold them from afar. But their faces are set and their steps are turned in our direction.

Every stage of this national anabasis may be counted by the adoption of some fresh element of Catholic belief or practice.

Let us count.

Roman collars, cassocks and birettas—vestments—altar-lights—incense—crucifixes and sign of the cross—eastward position—genuflection to Sacrament—wafer-bread—mixed

chalice—fasting Communion—reservation of Sacrament—sanctuary lamps—frontals and altar colours—images of saints—prayers and eucharists for dead—confraternities—monastic brotherhoods and sisterhoods—confession—mitres—pastoral staves—retreats for the clergy (even for “the wives of the clergy”).

All these make up a list of adoptions which have gone far, within the radius of their influence, to transform the face of the Established Church of England.

The “aggrieved parishioner”—one of the countless cousins of “Read and others”—was commonly supposed to writhe as he felt his Protestantism transfixed by the traditional “six” points. Now it is his lot to behold it impaled upon twenty.

However, let us think of it all under a happier figure. All these “adoptions” are clearly in the direction of light, warmth, colour and doctrinal significance. They are the signs which mark the approach of the Anglican vanguard to a brighter and sunnier region. They announce that it is drawing nearer to a Promised Land, and that it is emerging from the cold, bleak, bare, barren wilderness which stretches for nearly three centuries upon this side of the Reformation.

What are the more hopeful signs in this Homeward—Romeward Movement?

There are many. But we might safely single out for special notice the element of piety with which it is combined. And in that piety we might go further and particularise that zeal which has for its object to revive Christian devotion to the Passion and Crucifixion of our Lord.

The lesson of the Cross, with its mental discipline of utter abasement and emptying of self, is above all and beyond all the truest and strongest antidote to that heretical temper of individualism so full of pride and perversity which found its triumph in the Reformation.

It is, therefore, with consolation, blended with not a little hopefulness, that Catholics note in the Anglican movement year by year a growing fervour for the devout observance of Passiontide and Holy Week. That is as it should be

in a Christian land, and we trust too firmly in the truth of the maxim *per crucem ad lucem* not to feel that graces of love sooner or later mean graces of light, and that light leads faithfully those who follow it.

But such an approach to the centre-thought of all Catholic devotion brings with it—as we might expect it would—a fresh requisition upon the treasury of Catholic practices and services.

Hence to the long list of “adoptions” given above, we are not surprised to find that we have to add such well-known features of Catholic worship as “The Three Hours’ Agony,” the “Seven Words from the Cross,” the “Tenebrae,” and “The Way of the Cross”.

From a surprisingly large number of places come reports of the Good Friday being kept in Anglican churches and cathedrals by the preaching of the “Three Hours’ Agony”.

In at least one case the preacher was a Bishop of the Establishment.

We are standing outside the Church of St. Matthew’s, Walsall, before a notice which informs us that “on Good Friday the service of the Three Hours will be conducted by Dr. MacLagan, the Bishop of Lichfield”.

On our right an “aggrieved parishioner”—mystified as much as aggrieved—reads it and frowns, and passes on his way with a hissing mutter of which we only catch such words as “Jesuitism!” and “Romanism!”

And the gentle-voiced Anglican on our left whispers: “Heed him not. He speaks the Protestant dialect, and those are the terms which he indiscriminately applies to all things Catholic.”

But the aggrieved is right!

By a freak of good fortune, which his critics would say, happens to him not more than once in a lifetime, he has just hit the mark.

The devotion of the Three Hours on Good Friday is in its origin precisely what he described it—“*Jesuit*” and “*Roman*”.

Let us see.

Whenever we wish to set in relief and duly appreciate the worth and superiority of the Anglican in our own day, we hasten to draw a contrast between him and his ancestors in the last century.

In that stagnant Queen Anne and Georgian era, his great-grandfathers looked over the ridge of their high-backed pews to feel the influence of no more cheering or elevating helps to devotion than the Royal Arms, a three-decker pulpit, and a tablet of the Ten Commandments. That the service and sermon were not always less dry, dull and dreary than the surroundings, was, perhaps, a necessary adaptation to the starchy mannerism and somewhat somnolent taste of the period.

It was just at that time that a pious Jesuit missionary, Alfonso Messia, introduced in the churches of Lima, in Peru—a sort of religious antipodes to England—the beautiful practice of holding a Three Hours' Service on Good Friday, to sanctify the more sacred portion of the day during which the Saviour hung for our salvation on the Cross.

It was his custom to begin this solemn commemoration at noon, and continue it until after the third hour. During that time he preached a series of short and touching discourses to the assembled multitudes upon the "Seven Words" spoken by Christ on the Cross. The good Jesuit died in 1732.

His service of the Three Hours lived after him. It crossed the ocean, and found a home in the centre of Catholicity. In 1788 it was approved and practised in Rome; and early in the present century it was already common in a large number of churches in the city, such as the Gesù, St. Andrea della Valle, St. Maria in Aquiro, the Church of the Archconfraternity of Prayer, and in the Oratory of Padre Caravita. Both Benedict XIII. and Pius VII. granted special indulgences to all who would join in the devotion of the Three Hours' Agony, and the Meditation on the Seven Words (Moroni, vol. xc., 204).

From Rome it naturally passed into all parts of Catholic Christendom.

Thus this devotion so truly Christian and Catholic had its conception in the heart of a Jesuit priest, and its development in the fostering piety of the City of the Popes.

It is "Jesuitism" and "Romanism," and as figs do not grow upon thistles, nor grapes on thorns, no doubt the many fair-minded Anglicans who are now led to feel its beauty may learn, while they listen, to think with less suspicion and hostility of the sources to which they owe it, and the Church from which it has been borrowed for their benefit.

The devotion of the Seven Words has also found acceptance in Anglican services, if we are to judge by the quotations of Anglican devotional literature for the present Lent.

It is undoubtedly one of long standing in the Catholic Church. Nearly six hundred years ago a Franciscan Friar and Roman Cardinal, St. Bonaventure, infused into it his own burning piety, in his *Treatise upon the Seven Words of our Lord*. St. Erwald, the disciple of St. Bernard, as far back as the thirteenth century, wrote for his monastery in Chartres a treatise on the "Seven Words of Christ Crucified". (It is published in vol. clxxxix. of Migne's *Patrologia*.) In 1615 the Jesuit theologian and Roman Cardinal, Bellarmine, devoted his learning to the treatment of the same subject in his work, *On the Seven Words Spoken by Christ upon the Cross*.

Truly the ways of God are beyond the thoughts and hopes of men. When Messia preached the Three Hours in Lima, when Benedict XIII. and Pius VII. established the devotion at Rome, when Bellarmine wrote his treatise on the Seven Words, England was still in the most staunch and stern mood of uncompromising Protestantism. The sword of persecution was but half-replaced in its scabbard. Who could have foretold to these Jesuits, Cardinals and Popes, that the Catholic devotion which they were thus formulating and propagating would work its way from Rome into the very strongholds of their opponents, and that before the close of the nineteenth century it would be publicly used in

Anglican churches and cathedrals, and be preached from the mouth of an Anglican Bishop?

With such progress in the past, what may we not hope in the future?

These Passion-practices are but a detail.

What is the broad and general aspect covering the face of the movement? How sways the tide of that war which was declared at the Reformation between Anglicanism on the one side, and the Catholic Church upon the other?

Let us paint a picture.

Let us suppose for a moment that within the last fifty years a great change has passed over the mind and face of the Church of Rome. In Italy and on the Continent the clergy have cast off the cassock and collar and adopted the coat and white tie of Anglican ministers. Churches are closed on week days and low Masses are rare or obsolete. Masses are said in the afternoon and Communion received without fasting. In Rome itself statues of the Madonna and the Saints are removed from St. Peter's and many of the churches. Confession is sternly discouraged. Priests openly preach the Real Absence or mere symbolical presence of Christ in the Eucharist, and exhort their people *not* to genuflect to the Sacrament. Altar lights and sanctuary lamps are abolished. Protestant formulas and forms of worship are openly adopted in the Roman churches and cathedrals, and the correctest pattern of Geneva gown, or Anglican surplice, or academic cap studiously copied and used at the services.

And let us further suppose that such a movement has taken place publicly and plainly in the face of Christendom. What would it portend?

Every priest and prelate in Italy might protest until they were hoarse and their listeners were deaf, that they were still Roman and Catholic, and that they regarded Anglicanism as the bane of Christianity.

Their protests would be drowned by the louder voice of facts. All Europe would laugh at their quibbling and cry out—"the Reformation wins"!

But our picture is a negative. The converse is true.

The statue of the Madonna has not been taken down from St. Peter's. It has been set up in St. Paul's. It is not we who have clothed ourselves in the Anglican dress. It is the Anglicans who have clothed themselves in ours. It is not we who borrow their terminology, or their doctrines, or their ritual, or their devotions. It is they who borrow from us.

Then what does the movement mean? Two systems have been at war for three centuries—a war as real as that which was waged between France and Germany in 1870.

Germany won—but how can I tell for certain?

Somebody answers—Because the Germans went to Paris, and the French did *not* go to Berlin.

Then how goes the great doctrinal war? Is it the doctrines and practices of Rome that are going towards Anglicanism, or the doctrines and practices of Anglicanism that are going towards Rome?

What will be the answer when history broadly records the whole movement, and when posterity shall ask of it—In England, did Rome or the Reformation win?

Naturally, the following of the Higher Anglican movement, by the mere fact of its religious intensity, is something very different in bulk from the masses of the English people. We are thinking of the former, and especially insomuch as they are an influential factor in the religious life of the country.

The happiest thought in such a strife is that it is not our personal cause or our conquest, but the triumph of God and Truth over ourselves and the Anglican, and that to Him alone belong the peaceful victories of light which cover with the same glory both the victors and the vanquished.

CHAPTER XXIV.

An Anglican Monument.

(18TH APRIL, 1891.)

THE late Dr. Littledale was a zealous champion of Anglicanism.

Zeal claims recognition from those in behalf of whom it has been exercised. It is therefore but right and fitting that Anglicanism should raise a monument to his memory.

I fear that to us who stand within the Church and against whom so much of his zeal was directed, *Littledaleism* has almost come to be a recognised term.

It stands for a style of controversial writing in which every quarter of a page contains a suppression of what is true interwoven with the suggestion of what is false. Or others would say that it connotes a policy which consists in addressing to the "general public" *ex parte* historical pleadings, knowing that out of a hundred "general readers" not ten will ever take the time and trouble—even if they had the opportunity of doing so—to correct their impressions by reference to sources, or to balance them by a course of *ex altera parte* reading.

But obviously such methods are not to be linked with the name of any individual man, but rather with a sad resultant which comes of the combination of short-sighted zeal with the weakness of human nature. One can only wish that, whether used for us or against us, such tactics could be buried once and for ever in the grave of Dr. Littledale.

Certainly we have neither the wish nor the need to impugn Dr. Littledale's sincerity.

Who shall mark off the limits of the influence which love exercises on conviction. His zeal for the cause which he loved may have really closed his eyes to the facts which it seems to us that he suppressed, just as it may have made him believe that he saw as realities the falsities which we think that he suggested.

We behold and know from within, the life, the meaning and working of the system which he reviled from without,

and we seeing and knowing it, judge him not, but only feel that his statements taxed with something more than the usual strain our willingness to preserve at all hazards our belief in the good faith of those who are opposed to us.

Moreover, we think it very possible that amongst his Anglican readers, especially of the more scholarly kind—men who read to seek truth and not to seek weapons—there must be many, who in perusing his pages will ask themselves: Are all these issues quite fairly stated?—Is this the tone of a judicious and unbiassed writer?—Even of a charitable one?—Is this method of defence a religious or Christ-like one?—Is it even an English and straightforward one?

And other readers, whose minds are of the gentle and devotional mould, will ask: Is this the partisan zeal which breathes the spirit of contempt, hatred and bitterness—or is it the spirit of sweetness and light which comes from on high—the *lux beatissima replens cordis intima*, of which the Church sings in one of the sweetest and sublimest of her hymns? That is a criterion which is rather to be felt than expressed in words, but one, all the same, which good souls are wont to use unerringly.

However, we are not concerned with Dr. Littledale's style, nor with his writings, but with his monument.

We only refer to it, because it seems to us that Rome has taken a terrible vengeance for all his life-long labours against her.

He passes away. She remains, and in the playfulness of her strength she seizes his monument and appropriates it as a sort of iconostasis for her saints, and makes use of it as an image stand for the purposes of the great object-lesson that she is just now engaged in teaching the English people.

We were going to say that in revenge for all that Dr. Littledale had written against her Pontiffs she had called out a chosen posse of the most ultramontane of her saints and sent them to sit upon his tomb. But we remember that the memorial erected in his memory has not been placed over his grave, but has taken the shape of a reredos over the place where he was accustomed to minister.

It is thus described by *The Church Times*, 26th March, 1891:—

On the north side of the central figure is a representation of St. Richard, and on the south side one of St. Frederick, indicating the Christian names of the departed priest. Under the other canopies are figures of St. Charles Borromeo, St. Thomas Aquinas, St. Cyril, St. Athanasius, St. Teresa, and Dr. Thorndyke.

We at once make grace of Dr. Thorndyke. What he is doing, *dans cette galère*, we cannot even conjecture. He seems to have lost his way, and to have wandered inside our lines, and we hasten to restore him.

The others are all our own. A word as to each of them.

St. Richard! There is more than one St. Richard. One was an Anglo-Saxon prince of whom very little is known, save that he died on his way to Rome to pay his homage to the Pope.

Another St. Richard is an Englishman who, in the eighth century, was by the Pope appointed Bishop of Andria in Italy, and who lived and died in such faithful obedience to the Holy See that he was canonised by Boniface VIII.

Now the memorialists can hardly have intended their honours for this Papal Bishop!

Then there is only one other St. Richard who remains—the great St. Richard of Chichester.

As a Bishop of an English diocese, a Saint of the English Church, he is surely the one on whom the choice of advocates of the continuity theory would be most likely to fall.

We shall expect him, therefore, at least, according to the lights of his time, to uphold the independence of the English Church, repudiate the idea of appealing to Rome, and to maintain against the Pope that “Royal Supremacy” in matters ecclesiastical which Rev. Harvey Goodwin, an Anglican Bishop of Carlisle, calls “the foundation of civil and religious liberty”.

To show how St. Richard does all that, we cannot do better than cite from a sketch of his life, given a fortnight ago in the *Anglican Church Review*:—

On the death of St. Edmund in exile, at the Abbey of Soisi, in France, St. Richard relinquished all secular pursuits, and began the study of theology in a house of the Friars-Preachers at Orleans, and in due time was ordained priest. In A.D. 1245 Ralph de Nevile, Bishop of Chichester, having died, the Chapter proceeded by Royal licence to elect a successor. Hoping to win the favour of King Henry III., they chose the Archdeacon, an accomplished courtier, but so unfit for the duties of a Bishop that Boniface, Archbishop of Canterbury, refused to confirm his appointment; and a court of inquiry—consisting of the Primate, Grostete, Bishop of Lincoln, and others—having examined the causes of complaint, he was rejected, and Richard de Wyche was chosen in his room. The King was indignant, and confiscated the revenues of the see; but St. Richard without fear accepted the office, and appealed to Rome, whither he went to plead his cause.

Pope Innocent IV. decided in his favour, and consecrated him with his own hands. St. Richard then returned to England, bearing letters from the Pope to the King, enjoining him to submit to the decision; but Henry was only the more enraged, and the Bishop fell into deeper disgrace at Court, the courtiers, and even many of the clergy, taking the King's part against him.

St. Richard was now reduced to great straits by the confiscation of his revenues, and the insolence of the menials of the Court whenever he went to Windsor to ask his dues from the King. When no one else dared to oppose Henry's wishes, Symode Teringe received St. Richard, and lodged him in his house. In spite of his trials the holy prelate began to visit his people, going from town to town, and from one village to another, preaching and administering the Sacraments of the Church. At length his mild but firm endurance proved victorious, and at the end of two years King Henry relented and restored his manors.

How strange that St. Richard's whole position, life and action should have been the triumphant assertion of the very ultramontane claims which Dr. Littledale spent his life and labour in denouncing!

St. Richard may well look down from the height of the Anglican reredos and plaintively ask us: Was it for this that they planted me on the monument of Dr. Littledale?

St. Frederick was Bishop of Utrecht in the earlier part of the ninth century. William of Malmesbury claims him "as of English extraction," and "for the glory of the English race". He says that he was made Bishop of Utrecht because he was the nephew and disciple of St. Boniface and "breathing his spirit". Then let us see what was this "spirit of St. Boniface" which he breathed.

St. Boniface, also the glory of England while the Apostle of Germany, was the Pope's Vicar and Legate, or, as he styles himself in his letter to the English Bishops in 745: "Boniface, Legate in Germany of the Catholic Apostolic Roman Church" (Wilkins, i., 90). His biographer Othlo (c. xiv.) states that he took an oath of allegiance to the Holy See.

More than that.

Boniface informs the English Bishops of what he and his suffragans have just decided in their Council of the Church in Germany:—

"We have decreed in our Synodal Council Profession of the Catholic faith and unity, and our resolution to maintain as long as life shall last subjection to the Church of Rome: to be subject to St. Peter and his Vicar: to assemble our Synods once a year: our Metropolitans to seek their palls from that see, and in all things to seek to follow canonically the commands of St. Peter, so that we may be numbered amongst the sheep committed to his charge. And to this Profession, we have all given our assent and signature, and have forwarded it to the tomb of St. Peter, Prince of the Apostles, and the Roman Pontiff and clergy have joyfully received the same" (Wilkins, i., 91).

If St. Frederick "breathed the spirit of his master," as the English chronicler assures us that he did, he must have been decidedly Papal, not to say "Ultramontane".

Moreover, the very See of Utrecht, at the request of St. Boniface, was declared by Pope Stephen exempt from the jurisdiction of Cologne, and made directly "subject to the Roman Pontiff, to preach to the people of the Frisians" (Thomasini, *Vet. Ecc. Disc.*, ii., 41).

Dr. Littledale's main efforts were directed against the claims of the Pope and the authority of the Council of Trent. St. Charles Borromeo was a Roman Cardinal, the nephew of a Pope, and is known above and before all things as the zealous advocate and upholder of the doctrines and discipline of the Council of Trent. It is related of St. Charles that he could never read a letter from the Pope without standing uncovered, and, when he came to the end, kissing it even as at Mass we are wont to kiss the sacred page of the Gospel.

Hardly any formula of Church policy could be more "Ultramontane" than his famous declaration:—

"We must obey God. The Roman Pontiff holds His place, and whosoever seeks to weaken the authority of his commands cannot be obedient to God. *Our* duty is to lay before the Pope all that is needed. *His* duty is to tell us what he wishes us to do."

These words completely photograph St. Charles's whole life and action. Might one suggest that they should be engraved upon a scroll and placed prominently beneath his statue on the Littledale Memorial?

It is to St. Thomas Aquinas that the theology of the Church owes one of the plainest and clearest statements of the "Petrine claims".

He teaches that "the Pope wields the Vicarship of Christ over the whole Church" (2a, 2ae, q. 88), and defines the deadly vice of schism as "the refusal to be subject to the Sovereign Pontiff," "who is Vicar of Christ, as head of the Church" (ed, q. 39).

What the Angelic Doctor thought and held concerning the position of Dr. Littledale and his friends may be easily gathered from such teachings—and perhaps more clearly still from a quiet suggestion which he makes at the end of the same chapter to the effect that in cases in which such persons refuse to return to their obedience, the "secular power" might conveniently be asked to put them in order!

For our part we think the Saint's suggestion much too mediæval, but we should have thought that at the very least it would have earned for him a ready exemption from any invitation to mount guard on Dr. Littledale's monument.

The remaining Saints are hardly less Papal. St. Cyril of Alexandria acted as the zealous Papal Commissioner in the affair of Nestorius. St. Cyril of Jerusalem taught that "St. Peter was the first and chiefest of the Apostles," "the key-bearer of the kingdom of heaven". St. Athanasius pleaded his case at Rome against the Eusebians, and found in Pope Julius both a patron and a protector. St. Teresa, with all the intensity of her Spanish faith, held in horror the position

of those whom the Reformation had separated from the unity of the Church. She describes a vision in which she represents God as confirming the decisions of the Roman Nuncio. She took care that her great life-work and reform in the Carmelite Order should be blessed and crowned by the approving Brief of the Roman Pontiff. She is credited with saying that she would lay down her life even "for a Roman rubric".

And so to sum up.

Let us take our stand before the Anglican reredos and chant this Ultramontane Litany which it intones for us.

St. Richard, champion against the English Crown, of the authority of Rome! St. Frederick, disciple of Boniface, and sharer of his spirit of devoted allegiance to Rome! St. Charles, who declared that obedience to God meant obedience to Rome! St. Thomas, who taught that refusal to be subject to the Pope was deadly sin and schism from Christ and from His Church! St. Cyril, who acted as the mandatory of the See of Rome! St. Athanasius, who appealed to the Pope and took refuge at Rome! St. Teresa, who rejoiced to place her whole work under the sanction of Rome! pray for the cause of Catholic truth and unity in England!

Who shall say that the architects of this wonderful memorial were not blessed with something marvellously approaching to selective inspiration?

Can any one invent a phonograph made in such wise as to hear the voices of the future?

If so, let us be listeners to a *belle séance* at a meeting of a learned society in London some half-dozen centuries from to-day, when this memorial is dug up and produced in their midst as an archæological find.

We can hear the applause which follows the reading of an exhaustive paper, which tears utterly to shreds the possibility of such figures being found upon an Anglican monument. We can hear the speaker ask in tones of irony if they are to be told that people of the nineteenth century—the "century of the telegraph and telephone"—were so demented as to construct their monuments on the system of glorifying all

that was most opposed to the person whom they wished to commemorate—a sort of wild application of the principle of *lucus a non lucendo*.

Then we hear the quiet voice of another critic who literally cuts the ground from under the feet of the last speaker, by completely accepting the whole of his argument and cordially agreeing with his main contention, but using it to prove “what his previous research upon the subject had long since led him to suspect”—that the writer named Littledale was not an Anglican at all, and that the books commonly attributed to him were not the authentic productions of his pen.

They will settle the question no doubt, as most learned societies contrive to do, to their own satisfaction, and in their own wise way, deciding probably that the “placing of the statues was of course the work of a much later period”—but who will suggest to them as a secret of solution the mysteries of Anglican appropriation?

Be that as it may, a Catholic can well afford to be patient when he sees the Saints of his Church enriched in an Anglican reredos.

They will stand there and preach the sermons which stone can preach to all who pass before them. And possibly amongst those who come to marvel and gaze some will put to themselves a question: “After all, can the yoke of obedience to Rome be so hard or so heavy when so many of the noblest, the wisest and saintliest souls that this world has seen have rejoiced and glorified in the sweetness and lightness of the bearing of it?”

CHAPTER XXV.

Anglicanism in Ireland—“The Church of St. Patrick”.

(25TH APRIL, 1891.)

THE Anglican Church in Ireland is governed by a General Synod. This Synod guides and controls its corporate life

and action. It legislates freely (Anglicans on this side of the Channel would say—a great deal too freely!) on matters of doctrine, discipline and liturgy. To Irish Anglicans it is the Church Authority, and it practically fulfils the functions of an *Ecclesia Docens et Regens* as far as such a term can at all be applied to any Protestant assembly.

The first week of April, 1891, saw it assembled for its usual Annual Meeting at Dublin.

It is said that the past history of Ireland has done unmeasurably and irrevocably much to mould, if not to make, the distinctive character and genius of her people. Her life has been made up of associations so tragic and pathetic, of events so stirring, of relations so high-strung, of positions and problems so full of that quality of strainedness, which, with the precision of her ready tongue, she has termed “distressful,” that the island could hardly help becoming in many ways a training school of mental courage and of intensity of thought and feeling.

It is a courage, her cooler-souled critics say, which soars naturally to an ideal or an aspiration, and declines to be trammelled more than need be by the network of facts and figures that covers the ground beneath it.

That, of course, may be a mere exaggeration of cross-Channel criticism. But if it were otherwise, and if such were really the *genius loci*, it would help us, if it did nothing else, to solve the secret of a certain element of courage—almost too splendidly Celtic!—which vibrates in the Synodal address of the Protestant Archbishop of Dublin.

The Archbishop spoke as follows:—

In the spirit of courage, of unshaken attachment to my life-long associations, I believe there is a day coming—I cannot live to see it—when Ireland’s Ancient Church, like a dove covered with silver wings and her feathers with gold, will draw into her fold a willing people in the day of the Lord.

Which means *Anglicé*, that the Irish people will become Anglicans, and acknowledge the Royal Supremacy in religion

and adopt the Thirty-nine Articles and the Book of Common Prayer.

How is this change—this reversal of Irish character and history—to be effected?

But to gain this end our Church must be true to herself, holding her Catholic faith holy and undefiled, her primitive Creeds, her Apostolic orders, with its historic episcopate; not watering them down in the vain hope of drawing those now separated from her into her communion. So long as she is faithful to the heritage committed to her charge, but only so long, can she claim to be Ireland's Ancient Church, and her chief pastor the legitimate Coarb or successor of St. Patrick.

In as many words the Archbishop calls upon us to behold the Church identity between himself and his Synod on the one hand and Ireland's Ancient Church and St. Patrick on the other. That is daring, if it is nothing else.

Is it altogether due to our standpoint that the analogies are not nearly so plain as the differences?

We have already pointed out that St. Patrick was a monk and a life-long advocate of the monastic life.

In his *Confessions*, "written by his own hand," he congratulates himself that the effect of his mission in Ireland was to fill the island with monks and nuns. His words referring to the Irish people are:—

"Lately hath it been made the People of the Lord, and they are named as the children of God: the sons of the Saints and the daughters of the rulers are seen to be monks and virgins of Christ."

In his letter to Coroticus—a not less authentic writing of St. Patrick—he puts the same fact more plainly:—

"And the sons of the Irish and the daughters of the rulers became monks and virgins of Christ, so many that I am unable to number them" ("*Et filii Scotorum et filiae regulorum monachi fiebant et Virgines Christi quot enumerare nequeo.*"—*Epist. ad Corot.*).

The plain historical fact is that Ireland's Ancient Church was monastic. I suppose it is almost as plain that the Anglican Church in Ireland is not so.

At all events, if the Archbishop likes to put the matter

to a practical test, he might easily do so by preaching a sermon strongly advocating to the sons and daughters of the Orangemen of Derry, Enniskillen or Belfast the advantages of becoming "monks and virgins of Christ," and of restoring the glorious monasteries of St. Finnian, St. Bridget and St. Columba.

Such a sermon in any of the centres named would involve upon the city authorities the duty of taking the usual precautions.

In another part of his *Confessions* St. Patrick speaks of the priests as those "whom God has chosen out and entrusted with the supreme and Divine power that whomsoever they shall bind on earth shall be bound in Heaven".

(*Sacerdotes eius quos elegit et indulisit illis summam divinumque potestatem "quos ligarent super terram esse ligatos et in coelos"*.)

Is that a formula in which the Archbishop would find it convenient to speak of his clergy, say in drawing up an Irish Anglican catechism or addressing an Irish Anglican audience?

Mr. Whitley Stokes is a non-Catholic writer. He is sufficiently eminent as an authority upon Celtic records to have been chosen as editor of the edition of the Tripartite Life of St. Patrick, issued under the authority of the Master of the Rolls.

In his introduction to this work he gives the conclusions at which he has arrived as the most probable solution of the problems arising out of the life and journeyings of St. Patrick.

It is to the effect that the Saint, recognising the futility of any attempt to evangelise Ireland without a commission from the Pope, set out on his journey to Rome to obtain one, but that meeting in Gaul with St. Germanus (who, as Prosper tells us, was acting as Papal Vicar), he received from him the required Papal authorisation, and with it returned to prosecute his mission successfully in Ireland.

If this conclusion be at all correct, one difference between "Ireland's Ancient Church" and that of the Archbishop and

the Synod is that the one was based upon a recognition of Papal Authority, and that the other is based upon the rejection of it.

It is a case of yes and no—or as a recent writer has so well expressed it—of black and white continuity.

In the same introduction Mr. Whitley Stokes gives an interesting sketch of the form of Christianity taught in “Ireland’s Ancient Church”.

As illustrative of what that Church believed and taught concerning the Blessed Sacrament, he gives the following extract from the *Lebar Breac*—(a document which another eminent non-Catholic authority, Dr. Petrie, describes as “the oldest and best Irish manuscript relating to Church history now preserved, or which perhaps the Irish ever possessed”):—

“The Body which was born of Mary the perfect Maiden without destruction of virginity, without opening of the womb, without male presence, and was crucified by the unbelieving Jews from spite and envy, and arose after three days out of death, and sitteth at the right hand of God the Father in Heaven in glory and honour before Heaven’s angels, *it is that Body even as it is in Glory* which the righteous consume off God’s table, even of the Holy Altar.”

We may be allowed to doubt if the above teaching at all represents what the overwhelming majority of the Archbishop’s flock have in their mind when they approach their rite of Holy Communion.

Or, were the Archbishop asked to define the doctrine of the Eucharist—say, for a catechism to be used in Belfast!—would the above terms at all adequately and accurately convey his meaning?

In the same introduction we find that, in the Ancient Irish Church there was a popular proverb that a “man without a confessor was like a body without a head”. Mr. Whitley Stokes also tells us that there were four grievous crimes which were accounted so atrocious that they could not be atoned for by penance—a statement which may be

taken to mean that they were removed by reservation from the ordinary discipline of penance.

One of these was the "disclosing of Confession".

It is needless to say that unless the practice of Confession, and *Auricular* Confession existed, there could be no possibility of disclosure, and such a sin could have found no place even in the imagination, much less in the legislation, of the ancient Irish people.

Almost in the same breath with this claim for continuity with Ireland's Ancient Church comes the voice of the Synod itself, which hastens to give proof of it by a significant Resolution :—

That the attention of the General Synod of the Church of Ireland having been directed to a Resolution adopted by the Synod of the diocese of Dublin, by which it requests the General Synod "to take measures to prevent the introduction of the practice of Auricular Confession and priestly Absolution into the Church of Ireland," this General Synod hereby declares that the practice of Auricular Confession and priestly Absolution following it are unsupported by Scripture, and opposed to the freedom and directness of the access to God which it proclaims, alien also to the spirit of this Protestant Church of Ireland, which rejected these practices at the Reformation, and is of a tendency pernicious alike to the penitent and the confessor. This Synod, while recognising the duty of the clergy to convey, both in public and private, to penitent sinners who trust in Christ the assurance of God's pardon, expects that loyal Churchmen will act in accordance with the spirit and intention of the Church and her officers.

Anglican organs upon this side of the Channel never tire of impressing upon us that the Anglican Church in Ireland is Catholic, and *not* "Protestant". Here we have the General Synod of that Church, headed by the Archbishop, publicly and proudly declaring itself "this Protestant Church of Ireland".

It is not we who shall ever venture to say that Irish Anglicanism does not even know its own name.

It might be urged that the Protestant Resolution just cited was aimed at Auricular Confession only as compulsory or as practised by the Church of Rome.

Not so. The promoters were far too much on the alert to leave any such loophole of interpretation. They took care to make it clear as noonday that it was the Confession as practised in Anglican churches that was the special object of this Synodal condemnation.

In fact, their intention was rather plainly, if picturesquely stated by one of the speakers who explained their action by saying that

Although their own house may not be actually on fire, there were some amongst them who saw sparks falling from a sister Church, and that being the case, he thought it was time to call out the fire brigade, both for their own safety and that of their neighbours.

The issue was still more pointedly brought out when Dr. Carter begged that the words might be introduced "as practised in the Church of Rome".

The amendment to that effect was at once opposed and rejected. The Resolution was put, and was (says *The Record*) "passed by a large majority, the result being received with applause".

During the debate Canon O'Connor stated that the Resolution represented the mind of "ninety-nine out of every hundred members of the Church of Ireland". Few who have had the privilege to be acquainted with the well-informed Protestants in Ireland would feel in the least disposed to quarrel with his estimate.

The Archbishop in the course of his Synodal Address referred to, took occasion to deplore the want of unity in the Church over which he presides. He says:—

The danger is from within, not from without. Little prejudices, narrow-mindedness, self-righteousness, not, alas, unknown among us, fan the flame of internecine strife. Are we never to learn, never to exercise toleration to others, and a generous forbearance to all? Are there always to be parties in our Church ever striving to jostle out of her communion every one that differs from them? Is our Church to be the only branch of the great Anglican Communion without a common standing-ground, where men of different minds and channels of thought can dwell together in unity, as faithful sons of a common mother? Do we, with longing eyes and hands uplifted in prayer, seek for unity—unity among ourselves first, and then

unity with all separated from us—unity, if not in Church membership, at least in Christian fellowship? Can we expect God's blessing on our future if in a narrow spirit we split the Church into rival factions, each with its symbolism of doctrine, which they delight to hear rather than the truth it enshrines?

However, every cloud has its silver lining. At the end of the meeting—when the anti-confessional Resolution was passed with applause—the Archbishop took comfort in the thought that the Church unity in Ireland, such as it was, was still at least good enough to be a model to the rest of the Anglican Communion.

The Church Times says:—

The Primate, before pronouncing the Benediction, said the Church of Ireland was an example to the Anglican Communion of a Church at unity in itself.

There is undoubtedly a measure—we might say, a large and fervent measure—of unanimity amongst the members of the Protestant Church in Ireland.

But it is a unanimity which consists in cordially abhorring and resolutely condemning nearly all those truths and practices which truth-loving Anglicans in England have learned to love and treasure as a sacred and precious part of the "faith once delivered to the Saints".

Many of these will look across the English Channel and ask themselves if, after all, Rome may not be nearer than Dublin.

CHAPTER XXVI.

Lay Representation or Lay Dictation in the Church—An Irish Synod.

(2ND MAY, 1891.)

THE Irish Anglican Synod, in its recent meeting, condemned the Confessional.

The Archbishop expressed his "abhorrence" of it.

Almost concurrently with this manifesto of Anglicanism in Ireland comes the following account of Anglicanism in America, given in *The New York Sun*:—

Things are done openly in this country which in England are done only secretly, if at all. For instance, in St. Ignatius's Church, in West Fortieth Street, a legend on the vestibule wall announces that "A red light burning in the sanctuary lamp signifies that the Blessed Sacrament is reserved in the tabernacle on the altar". Another announcement sets forth that "Confessions are heard on Saturday from three to five p.m., and from half-past seven to nine p.m."

Confession is practised in churches which are not deemed especially High. Dr. Dix, for instance, and the other clergymen of Trinity Church, hear Confessions as a matter of course. The Rev. Dr. Houghton, of the Little Church Around the Corner, is said to hear more Confessions every week than any Roman Catholic clergyman in the city. "I send all my hard cases to him, although he doesn't know it," said recently the ritualistic priest who is responsible for this assertion.

The sequel is hardly suggestive of the "prudence of the seal".

The clergyman added: "I am a perfect cesspool. Such horrible things are poured into my ears that I can hardly sleep at night when I remember them."

A Catholic confessor would not have suffered himself to remember them. If the penitents who had knelt at his tribunal had been more than usually many and sin-laden, he would have gone to rest all the happier, and have slept all the more soundly. He would have remembered nothing but the blessedness of God's boundless mercy, the joy of speaking the sweet words of absolution, and would have fallen asleep in thanking God for the precious souls restored to the joys of His peace and pardon. The whole instinct of his vocation would have helped him to banish from his mind what had been "redder than scarlet," and think only of what Christ had "made whiter than snow".

The greater liberty which exists in America for the teaching and practice of Confession may be traced to a constitutional cause.

American Anglicanism, to a large extent, is of the congregational build. Each church is generally supported by revenues drawn from within itself. The diocese is governed with a light hand and a loose rein. The body as a whole

has no common control except such as may come from a Convention which meets only once in three years, and even then does not and cannot go much farther than acting as a General Purposes Committee.

Hence when Dr. Dix, of Trinity Church, wishes to hear Confessions and to uphold the Confessional as the Divine work of Christ, he is as free as the American Eagle to do so.

And if his fellow-clergyman in the neighbouring church chooses to denounce the Confessional as sinful and superstitious and the work of Satan, he is just as free to do the same.

And Bishop Potter, of New York, will come with equal readiness to both churches and confirm the young people of both congregations, so that they may grow up in the strength and conviction of their respective ministrations.

How true it is that America reproduces upon a larger scale some of the familiar features of British freedom!

Anglicanism in Ireland is in a widely different position.

It has in its General Synod a governing body, whose charter is statutory and whose control is a reality. Its organisation is compact, and the financial solidarity of the body invests it with a fair grasp of coercive authority over its ministers.

Its most notable feature is the overwhelming preponderance of power given to the laity. It is composed of 208 clergymen and exactly double that number of laymen.

At times the vote is taken solidly from the general body. At other times it is taken separately or "by orders".

In the latter case the laity have only to vote adversely to veto effectually any decision that may be arrived at by the clergy; while in the former case the laity, by their numbers alone, are always sure of an easy and clear majority. Thus, let the voting be solid or separate, the laity are left completely masters of the situation.

The effect is obviously to vest the maximum of ecclesiastical power in the class which presumably possesses the minimum of ecclesiastical aptitude and learning.

We have before our minds a venerable and cultured and devout Irish Anglican clergyman, who has devoted long years of his leisure amid the awful stillness of an Irish parish to the study of the Fathers, of ancient liturgies and of sacred archæology.

On arriving at Dublin for the Synod he has found there before him two of his parishioners, lay-representatives of his diocese, elected to take part in the same assembly. They are estimable country squires, whose opinion on the points of a hunter, the chances of a grand jury presentment, or the qualities of the latest blend of bone-manure would be invaluable. Just now, they have come to help their clergy to settle matters of liturgy and theology.

In the Synod the worthy clergyman finds himself helplessly outvoted by them, and his power for achieving all that he has most at heart for the good of his Church is, in view of their double vote, reduced to a cypher.

They are the same gentlemen who, a few years since, helped to "revise" for him the Prayer-book by taking out of it just what he loved most, and who brought tears into his eyes when, with a fierceness that was almost Arian, they voted the elimination of the rubric requiring the recitation of the Athanasian Creed.

And now they have come once more to help to decide for him the liturgical forms which he must observe in administering the Eucharist, and the doctrines he must preach to them, when all three go back to the Wild West for next Sunday.

He, for one, feels that no good can ever come of what he plaintively describes as "inverting the relative position of the Church teaching and the Church taught". He thinks that when the gentleman in the pew practically decides what has to be preached in the pulpit, it is high time that he should come up and preach it himself, and let the clergyman devote the rest of his days to some more useful occupation.

Such features of Synodal rule form a curious commentary on the invectives directed against the Catholic Church as the foe of religious liberty.

The choice of masters may possibly be a matter of taste.

But to us as Catholics, there seems to be infinitely more of spiritual majesty and dignity, of Christian self-respect and of religious liberty in receiving God's free-making Word and Law upon the Infallible Authority of the Church Catholic and the Chair of Peter, than Anglicans are ever likely to find in such Synods as those which their system has created at Dublin.

But there is an after-thought to such reflections.

When all comes to be tested, the Irish Synod is right, according to its way. Theirs, after all, is the true type logically born of the Anglican system.

Why?

Because chief control in an ecclesiastical body must always be somewhere. And in last analysis, the points in which it can exist are, and can be, only three.

The Pope, with the Episcopate—the Crown—and the People.

But in reality the principle which underlies these three reduces the choice to two.

For, while all power is "of God," it can only proceed in one of two directions. Either from God to the people, and thence upwards to their mandatories—or from God to His mandatories, and thence downwards to the people.

The upward current is a democracy, and the downward is a theocracy.

The Crown may be either.

Looked at in the light of the theory of the Divine Right of Kings—which the Royal Supremacy in religion really postulates—it is a theocracy. Shall we say that that theory is dead and buried in the grave of the Count de Chambord, with the white flag for its winding-sheet? On the other hand, the Crown, constitutional or limited, is but one of the highest forms of democracy.

And thus to all students of Church systems sooner or later must come the choice of the two currents. Rule from above or rule from below—the Pope or the People.

In a society like the Church, which is *supernatural*, whose end lies beyond the natural competency of its members, it

is necessary that power to reach that end should come from above and downwards and take the form of a theocracy. In a society like the State, which is *natural*, and whose end lies within the natural competency of its members, it is just as logical and as desirable that the God-given power to reach that end, vested in its constituent members, should go upwards to its freely chosen rulers either in the form of a democracy or representative government, or of an aristocracy if the members so wish it. Hence Catholics who are necessarily theocratic in religion, may be, and are, according to their taste, democratic or aristocratic in their political sympathies. In fact, as St. Thomas Aquinas so well points out, the Church combines in her constitution the best elements of monarchical, aristocratic and democratic government. Yet by reason of her supernatural end, and supernatural derivation of her powers, she is marked off from all earthly societies, and her authority does not proceed from nor depend upon her people.

But why not government by Synods ?

Because Synods of their nature fall under one or other of the principles named. A Synod belongs either to a theocracy above it or a democracy below it:

If Synods are theocratic, they will hold their authority directly from God, and they will not allow their rule to be trammelled by those whom they govern. If they are democratic, they will owe their power to the governed, and will naturally be controlled by them.

Besides, a Synod is not a simple, but a composite term, and requires an ulterior power—(which, by this very fact, is its master)—to create it, unite it, and hold it in effective unity.

Then to what prospect of Church government do thinking Anglicans look forward? *Via media* there is none.

Do they frankly accept the democratic principle in Church government, and embrace as their ideal such Synods as the Dublin Assembly or the American Convention, which is made up of clergy and laity, and in which a four-fifths majority can overrule the whole bench of Bishops ?

Or do they hope to maintain a theocratic form, in which the Bishops chosen "to rule the Church of God," shall do so instead of being ruled by the whole body of their clergy and people?

If so, is there any part of the world in which their hope has the faintest chance of being fulfilled?

We look in vain over the whole globe to find a non-Catholic people who are willing to entrust Church government to the Bishops alone, and who will allow their authority to make or enforce a degree which does not fall in with the opinions and tastes of the clergy and the laity.

The truth is that Anglicanism, in rejecting the Catholic theocracy of the Pope and the Church, has left itself no standing ground but such as it can find upon democratic sand-banks. No Bishop, or body of Bishops can sever the tie which binds them to Peter and the Universal Church without loosening that which binds to them in turn the allegiance of clergy and people. Power which is rejected from above will be caught at and claimed from below.

Thence we take it that Dublin Synods and American Conventions, with their lay supremacy, are true and logical products of the Anglican system.

They are the mirrors, we think, in which English Anglicanism may behold its face in the future.

N.B.—The following quotation from a standard work will be of interest in reference to the preceding chapter:—

"The General Synod is to consist of three distinct Orders, *viz.*, the bishops, the clergy, and the laity, and of two Houses, the House of Bishops, and the House of Representatives. Both Houses are to sit together in full Synod for deliberation and transaction of business, except in cases provided for by the statutes. The House of Bishops is formed of all Archbishops and Bishops for the time being; and the House of Representatives of 208 representatives of the clergy and 416 representatives of the laity. The representatives are to be returned from the dioceses in certain proportions specified in the statutes, and to be elected triennially by Diocesan Synods, whose constitution is afterwards prescribed.

"The members of the House of Representatives are to vote together, unless, upon a division being called, ten members shall by a requisition in writing require the votes to be taken by Orders, when they shall be so taken, the Orders then voting separately.

“Every proposed statute or canon is to be introduced as a Bill, the procedure in connection with its introduction, and subsequently in order to its becoming law, is to be in accordance with regulations expressly specified. The Bishops are to vote separately, and no question shall be deemed to be carried unless there be in its favour a majority of the Bishops present, if they desire to vote, and a majority of the lay and clerical representatives present voting conjointly or by Orders, but if a question affirmed by a majority of the clerical and lay representatives voting conjointly or by Orders, but rejected by the Bishops, shall be reaffirmed at the next ordinary session of the General Synod, by not less than two-thirds of the clerical and lay representatives, voting conjointly or by Orders, it shall be deemed carried, unless it be negatived by not less than two-thirds of the then existing Order of Bishops, the said two-thirds being then present and voting, and giving their reasons in writing. A Bill has to be read twice before going into Committee, then, when it has passed through Committee, in order to become law it must be read a third time. No modification or alteration can be made in the articles, doctrines, rites, rubrics or (so far as was rendered necessary by the Church Act) in the formularies of the Church unless by a Bill. A Bill for any such purpose must be founded upon a resolution passed by the Synod, and no such Bill or resolution shall be deemed to be passed except by majorities of not less than two-thirds of each Order of the House of Representatives present and voting.”

In another chapter on the legislation passed by the General Synod since disestablishment, some enactments in relation to the Prayer-book, services for public worship and formularies of the Church are of importance.

The Church Act, while leaving in force the then existing Articles of Faith, the discipline, rules, rites and doctrine of the Church, gave the Church assembled in Synod power to modify and alter them.

Propositions were therefore brought forward on several occasions in the General Synod in reference to these subjects, which led to a revision of the Prayer-book and the services. Canons, in many respects substantially new, were also enacted.

Reformed Church of Ireland, Right Hon. J. T. Ball, LL.D., etc. (Longmans).

CHAPTER XXVII.

Anglicanism and the Erastian Principle.

(9TH MAY, 1891.)

ONE of the most happy and hopeful tendencies of the newer Anglicanism is an awakening sense of the rightful independence of the Church.

.

A century ago and the bishops and clergy of the Establishment were frankly Erastian. In the century before that, there was something approaching to a cultus of the Royal Supremacy. Yet another century back, and we are in the midst of that complaisant episcopate who allowed Henry VIII. to suspend it of all its episcopal powers for one month, and only recovered them when each Bishop had humbly petitioned the Supreme Head of the Church to restore what he had taken away (Collier, ii., Rec., p. 22). Beyond these, we can see in the background that sad Convocation that consented to crucify its conscience provided only that it might be allowed to wash its hands in the parenthesis—*in quantum per legem Christi licet*.

.

That Anglicanism, emerging from such an atmosphere, should seek to breathe more freely and to hope for better things, is not the least precious element of its new ethos.

The chief Anglican topic of the moment is the Clergy Discipline Bill, and the very reason that it is so is due to the fact that it has contrived to call forth the friction which exists between the old Erastian ideas and the newer school, which has learned to think of the Church as a complete spiritual and independent society.

The law, as it stands, declares that when a clergyman has been convicted of a felony, his living becomes by the fact vacant.

In other words, the secular law, acting through its own Court, judge and sentence, and without at all troubling the Bishop about the matter, effects the deprivation of a clergyman.

To deprive of cure of souls is as much an act of ecclesiastical jurisdiction as to give it, and although there are forty cases in which a benefice becomes, *ipso facto*, voided by ecclesiastical law, yet the spectacle of the secular power thrusting in its arm between a Bishop and his people and wrenching a clergyman out of his cure, would, in Catholic times, have sent a thrill of horror through the soul of every Canonist in Europe.

The Civil Power in one sense can indirectly, but, on the whole, effectually deprive a clergyman by shooting or hanging him, for it is very clear that a dead man cannot hold a benefice. But, according to the Catholic theory, if he be left in the land of the living, even though buried in a dungeon or banished to the Antipodes, he is still bound to his benefice by a spiritual bond which nothing but the law or sentence of the Church can sever.

English law, as applied to the Establishment, is a practical negation of this principle of canonical liberty.

We should have expected Anglican Bishops loving the independence of their Church to have said: "This is a bad law. Let us have it repealed."

They have said just the contrary: "It is a good law. Let us have it extended." And translating wishes into deeds, the Archbishop of Canterbury has had passed through the House of Lords the "Clergy Discipline Bill".

It is the former law, only more so. That is to say, the deprivation is to take place by the very fact that the secular Court pronounces its sentence—but, for the future, not merely when the clergyman is convicted of a felony, but also if he is convicted of "any grave misdemeanour".

Of the excellent intentions of the framers of the law, and of the excellent results to be expected from its working, there is no doubt whatever.

But neither excellence of intentions nor of results can atone for a breach of principle. Many sincere Anglicans who have learned to form to themselves a higher and nobler concept of the Church have watched the proceeding with sorrow and misgiving. The law is Erastian enough as it is.

They feel that it is a pity that the Archbishops should have gone out of their way to make it more so.

The feeling of protest has found a voice, as we might expect, in the meeting of the English Church Union.

One of the speakers maintained that the Union

Preferred principle to expedience; and however expedient it might be that criminous clerks should be removed from the cure of souls, there was something more important that the Union had to support, and that was that they should be removed on right principles.

And again:—

He could not accept the position of the Archbishop of York. There was no doubt that a measure of the kind was desirable, but it was not so desirable as to compel the Church to accept a Bill which was based on wrong principles. The E.C.U. could not accept the adage that "Any stick would do to beat a dog with," for sometimes the stick hurt the hand that wielded it more than it did the dog which was beaten with it; and he was convinced that this Bill, if passed in its present shape, would do incalculable harm to the Church, without having the effect it was intended to have.

In accordance with these views, the Union has drawn up the following petition to the Houses of Convocation:—

That inasmuch as the deprivation of a priest from the cure of souls is a purely spiritual action, and belongs to the jurisdiction of the Episcopate—your petitioners, whilst they welcome any attempt to improve existing machinery for the removal of criminous clerks, humbly submit, in reference to the Clergy Discipline (Immorality) Bill, now before Parliament, that suspension or deprivation from the cure of souls must proceed from that Episcopal Authority which alone has the power to confer or withdraw it.

Your petitioners, therefore, humbly pray your House to take such steps as may be necessary to protect in this respect the spiritual rights of the Church, and the authority of the Episcopate.

The principle is an excellent one.

And "better late than never" is the best answer to those who, with a volume of English history in their hands, may observe that it is very late in the day to have thought of it.

In Convocation these higher views found a vigorous opponent in the Archbishop of York.

His argument was logical enough. It was to the effect that if the principle of the protesters was good, their protest ought to have been made against the existing law itself, and not against the present measure which merely widens the application of it. (We should have gone farther back still for the logical ground of protest and remedy.)

Dealing with such objections Dr. Magee says :—

And the first misapprehension is that this is an entire novelty in clergy discipline, introduced here for the first time by the authors of this Bill. Well, the fact is that it is no novelty. For many years, I am afraid to say how many, it has been the law that certain offences, felonies, shall *ipso facto* on conviction vacate a benefice.

The identity of principle he establishes as follows :—

It seems to me that if you adopt the principle at all you are perfectly justified in extending it to these misdemeanours. But we are told that the principle itself is wrong, that it is Erastianism of the deepest dye, and that if we do not introduce it now for the first time in this Bill we should take the opportunity of getting rid of it, at all events incompletely, from the Bill and from all Clergy Discipline Bills in the future. It is held that a Bishop, having given a cure of souls and government of the parishioners of a certain place to a clergyman, no one but he who has given it should be allowed to take it away, and that by sentence of deprivation. In the first place, I need not repeat that this is new law ; but I think many persons are not aware of how far the principle of the law would extend, and how far at the present moment benefices are vacated without a sentence of deprivation.

But still better is the position sketched in the passage which follows :—

Then take again this consideration, that while it is held to be an enormous innovation of spiritual jurisdiction for a Court of law to deprive a man *ipso facto*, no one has yet that I know of made any objection to the Court suspending a man for three years. Now surely if the action of the Bishop committing the cure of souls to a man be a thing indefeasible by any authority but the Bishop, there is really no difference in principle—there may be in the result, but there is certainly none in principle—between a Court of law coming in between the Bishop and the man and saying to him, “Though you have cure of souls, and though the Bishop has given you and has not taken away from you that charge, you shall not exercise that cure for three years,” and saying, “You shall not exercise that cure for thirty years”. I confess I myself see no essential difference in point of principle. At all events, this much is perfectly clear from the cases I have shown to you, and that is a point

of very great importance, to which I wish particularly to draw your attention : it is very clear that as long as these laws existed—and you observe that there are a great many of them—and unless they were all repealed, then it clearly follows that the Bishop does not and cannot give to the incumbent cure of souls *simpliciter*, without qualification or condition. The Bishop can only give what it is in his power legally to give, and if there are laws—which there are—which distinctly limit the tenure of the cure of souls under certain conditions, and deny to the Bishop the power of retaining a man in that cure until he deprives him by sentence, then it is clear that the Bishop gives the cure of souls subject to those conditions which are pre-existing conditions before the institution is given.

That means the Anglican Bishop can only bestow the cure of souls subject to conditions which the civil power lays down for him, which, being interpreted, seems to us a fair and frank statement of the status of a Bishop under the system of the Royal Supremacy.

The Anglican opponents of the Bill, with a view to safeguard the principle which they loved, suggested that concomitantly with the sentence delivered by the secular Court there might be one of deprivation pronounced by the Bishop.

Dr. Magee handles the suggestion not with the cloudy vagueness of diction which is often the Anglican for *transeat*, but with perfervid Celtic scrutiny :—

But I ask you, in the last place, to consider whether if you could repeal all these laws—and he would be a very bold man who would say that you could repeal them, or could induce Parliament even to listen to the proposal for the repeal of all these laws before you passed your Clergy Discipline Bill, or after or with it ; but supposing all that could be done, would you get rid of the difficulty of the conflict of jurisdictions and the supposed Erastian tendency of the law ? I confess it appears to me that you will not, and that you will only succeed in throwing that difficulty a little further back. What is proposed, if I rightly understand it, is this—not that the Bishop shall rehear the case, not that the Bishop shall have any discretion as to whether he will or will not pronounce sentence of deprivation. I have heard no one person worthy of consideration seriously propose that when a Court of law and a jury have convicted a man of a felony, the Bishop shall thereupon proceed to try him over again in the spiritual Court for that felony. I do not think—I should be unwilling to do any injustice—but I do not think that that is meant by the opponents of this Bill ; but they mean that when the sentence of the Court of law, the secular Court,

has found the man guilty of and punished him for a crime, a subsequent sentence of deprivation, not "may" but "shall" be read by the Bishop. If they do not mean that, of course the whole Bill and every idea of clergy discipline would be pure waste-paper. But if they do mean that, then what I think they do mean is that the person who shall inflict or recite the sentence of deprivation shall be the Bishop. Then observe in what position you put the Bishop. He is given absolutely no discretion in this matter. The Bishop is in the position of the dead hand of the Court; a mere crier of the Court who gives effect to the sentence of the Court. Now, apart altogether from the question of whether that is a position in which you should place the Bishop as regards his clergy, and whether it is not a position absolutely intolerable, observe, as I have said, how you throw this difficulty of conflict of jurisdiction and of Erastian intrusion of the secular into the spiritual only one step further back. For what is the difference in principle—if I may use a homely phrase to make my meaning clear—between Parliament putting its own hand on the shoulder of the incumbent and thrusting him out of his benefice, and Parliament taking my hand, dead and unresisting, and putting it on his shoulder and impelling me until I compel him to go out? What is the difference between Parliament or the Court of law driving the incumbent out and the same Court of law driving the Bishop to drive the incumbent out? It does seem to me that you simply succeed in driving back to a previous stage the same difficulty and raising it in its most acute and, I venture to add, in its most dangerous form as between the Bishop and the Courts of law.

That, we take it, is description mercilessly illustrative of the position and status of an Anglican Bishop.

What did Convocation do with it? Three things.

First, it showed by the general tone and tenor of its speeches that it did not at all like the Bill in its present form.

Secondly, it rejected all amendments which voiced that feeling, and passed a resolution in favour of the Bill just as it stands.

Thirdly, it adopted the following motion:—

That his Grace the President and their Lordships of the Upper House be respectfully requested to apply, in the event of the Clergy Discipline (Immorality) Bill, 1891, becoming law, without any modification of Clause 2, for license from the Crown to Convocation so to amend the Canons as to bring them into conformity with the said clause of the said Bill.

Which being interpreted means: "If the Crown will not do what we approve, let us ask the Crown to give us leave to approve what the Crown does".

That is certainly one way of avoiding the friction of Church and State.

Such episodes go to teach us that the battles of St. Anselm and St. Thomas à Beckett, St. Edmund, Peckham and Stratford could never be fought upon Anglican lines.

Were a Primate or a Bishop of the Establishment to enter upon such a conflict, one cannot but wonder where he would find a *locus standi*? and where his following?

An effect never recoils upon its cause, and an institution which is the child of a given power instinctively shrinks from striking at its father.

To resist the secular power there must be an independent standing ground for the fulcrum of the effort. No room for any such leverage is provided under the system of Royal Supremacy. The Supreme Head of the State will never resist the Supreme Governor of the Church, when, in each case, the Head wears the same crown, and rests upon the same neck and shoulders.

Under such an arrangement, any attempt at resistance of the secular by the ecclesiastical power seems to us suggestive of the effort of the man who endeavours to lift himself up by his ears.

Hence, as we see it from the Catholic standpoint, the new Anglican ideal of a spiritually Independent Church is hopeless for the very reason that it is much too good and too great to fit into the Anglican system. The frame-work designed by Henry VIII., Cranmer and Cromwell was certainly never meant to support such a superstructure, and, to receive such an enlargement, it would have to be taken down and rebuilt from the foundation.

Not the less may we feel thankful that such principles and such ideals have found friends in the high places of Anglicanism.

The queenliness of the beauty of the Catholic Church is to us the stamp of her Divine origin. She treads the earth, and

comes down the long aisle of the centuries clothed with the royalty of her Founder. She walks as a queen. For a Catholic mind it would be easier to believe that two and two make five than that Christ intended His Spouse to be degraded into a hand-maiden of Cæsar.

CHAPTER XXVIII.

A Papal Encyclical.

(6TH JUNE, 1891.)

THE publication of the Pope's Encyclical on the Labour Question has elicited a query from certain Anglican inquirers.

Is it spoken *ex cathedrâ*?

Is it infallible?

A plain question deserves a plain answer.

We submit the plainest possible "No" as the answer.

Papal pronouncements *ex cathedrâ* are hardly of a kind to be mistaken when they come.

Encyclicals like the present stand upon a lower and totally different plane. They are marked off from the Chair-Teaching by three salient and patent differences—of matter and method and sanction.

An utterance *ex cathedrâ* is occupied about questions of Divine revelation as to matters of faith or morals which have arisen in such a way as to have two sides. They are delivered at a moment when it has become necessary to say which side has to be held and which side has to be rejected. *Controversies of faith* is the technical term, and it at once conveys both the subject-matter and the two-sided form in which the subject-matter presents itself for solution by Apostolic pronouncement.

But the recent Encyclical has no such mission or task. There is no question of deciding any principles of Divine revelation. On the contrary, the Encyclical recites as its basis such principles as are already recognised and decided, and simply proceeds to apply them to the current problems of social and political economy.

To use an awkward metaphor, it is one process to forge a sword out of the duly appointed material, and a quite distinct process to use the sword thus made to cut and cleave the knots of social errors and difficulties.

Then there is a difference of manner.

An infallible Papal pronouncement, according to the very words of the Vatican Decree, includes an act of "*definition*". The Pope when he speaks *ex cathedrâ*, *defines*. He teaches and tells the whole Church in the clearest possible manner that a given doctrine A is contained in and is conformable with Divine Revelation, and as such is to be held and taught, and that a given doctrine B, which is opposed to it, is as such to be condemned and rejected. Hence the Papal utterance, by force of the very law by which speech expresses thought and purpose, speaks the language of definition, even if the actual word be not employed.

A fair sample of the "defining" formula is found in the dogmatic Bull in which was proclaimed the Immaculate Conception:—

"To the honour of the Holy and Undivided Trinity, for the praise and adornment of the Virgin Mother of God, for the exaltation of the Catholic faith and the advancement of the Christian religion, by the Authority of our Lord Jesus Christ, and of the Blessed Apostles Peter and Paul and our own, We declare, pronounce and define that the Doctrine which holds the Most Blessed Virgin Mary to have been, by the singular grace and privilege of the Almighty God, in view of the merits of Christ Jesus, the Saviour of Mankind, preserved from the first moment of her conception, free from all stain or original sin, is revealed of God, and therefore to be constantly and firmly held by all the faithful. Wherefore if any shall presume—which God avert—to inwardly believe otherwise than has been by Us defined, let them know and certainly understand that they are condemned by their own judgment, have suffered shipwreck of their faith, and have fallen away from the Unity of the Church."

Any reader may see for himself that the Encyclical is written in a widely different key, and that it contains no hint of authoritative definition.

“The Popes have always made quite clear when they pronounced such decisions,” says one of the most eminent and most reliable of authorities on the subject, the late Cardinal Hergenröther, and he instances the Bull *Unam Sanctam* of Boniface VIII., in which the formulæ used are, “We declare, We define, We pronounce” (*Church and State*, vol. i., 86).

We should look in vain for any trace of such language throughout the entire fifty-two pages of the Encyclical.

A third condition of *ex cathedrâ* pronouncements is that they express a binding obligation of belief on the part of the whole Church. Hence the definition is, as a rule, accompanied by a declaration of censures to be incurred by those who refuse their assent to the doctrine decided.

Thus Cardinal Hergenröther (*loco cit.*) says: “The intention of binding all the faithful in virtue of the office of supreme teacher must be expressly stated”. And he cites the following clear rule set forth in the work of Gregory de Valentia :—

“As often as the Roman Pontiff uses that authority with which he is invested in defining questions of faith, that decision, which he lays down as a decision of faith, ought to be received by all the faithful as a doctrine of faith by Divine command. But he is to be regarded as using that authority as often as he so decides one or other opinion in a controversy of faith that he intends *the whole Church to be obliged to receive it.*”

In the recent Papal Letter there is clear statement of fundamental laws, masterly diagnosis of the evils of the day which have arisen from a disregard of them, and, finally, a wise prescription of remedies for sick society.

But a decision of faith binding the belief of the faithful has no place either in the matter or the scope of the Encyclical.

Then what is the good of it?

The good of instruction. The good of guidance. The good of admonition and exhortation. And all three from the highest pulpit in Christendom.

Father A—preaches a sermon to his people. He sets forth the old truths and the eternal maxims, and makes a keen application of them to the small world of his parish. Or Bishop B—does the same, on a larger scale and in statelier terms, in a pastoral to the clergy and faithful of his diocese. Both the sermon and the pastoral in its main substance would claim the reverent attention and assent of those to whom they are addressed. They would contain much that no Catholic as a Catholic could call in question. The spiritual excellence and value of both would be felt and recognised. No member of the larger or smaller flock would esteem them the less because, technically, neither the pastoral nor the sermon is *in se* infallible. All would be content in the knowledge that both are fair statements of the main principles and teaching—the magisterium—of the Church which lies behind them, and which is indeed infallible. The aptness of the illustrations and the exactness of the applications, the logic of the deductions, and the wisdom of the specific recommendations would rest largely on their own merits, or on the precision with which they reflected and voiced the Divine magisterium of the Catholic Church of which they are the accredited presentments. These would supply the human—and, *pro tanto*, fallible—element which, interwoven with the Divine, makes up that blended theandric type of beauty which runs throughout the whole system of the Incarnation.

It would be hard indeed if the Holy Father could not address the wider parish of the whole flock, and direct his pastoral wisdom to its manifold wants and ways, without involving upon his every utterance the sublime and solemn character of Papal Infallibility.

When any crisis or “controversy of faith” shall arise to require it, the higher gift, and help, we may be sure, shall not be wanting, and Peter, with the “faith that fails not,” shall as of old “confirm his brethren”,

When he speaks from the Chair he will no doubt make all Christendom understand that he does so.

Until then, would-be dogmatisers from within, and would-be critics from without, must possess their souls in patience, and take the Encyclical for what it was intended.

CHAPTER XXIX.

Anglicanism and the Easterns.

(25TH JULY, 1ST AUGUST, 8TH AUGUST, 1891.)

THE Anglican movement in Asia is hardly less interesting than its struggles with MacQueary-ism and Hebert Newtonism in America.

Needless to say that these two fields of Anglican activity are about as totally different as they are widely apart. The East is not the West, and the Old World is not the New.

Work is coloured by its environment, and no one can expect to find it at all alike in the Continent of Independence and Perpetual Motion and in the Continent of Bacsheesh and Immobility.

Turning Eastward, one is struck by the fact that Anglican progress is marked not so much by an expansion of missionary plant or area, as by the adoption of a new and rather interesting type of missionary venture—one, we think, which is distantly related to the Jerusalem Bishopric.

We may be allowed to put this speciality in clearer relief by asking a question.

Why do missionaries leave their homes in Europe and go out to labour in the East?

We hear the reader's answer.

They go to carry thither the religion which they believe to be the saving Truth, and their work is to win to it the minds of the Eastern peoples.

Or to expatiate:—

Missionaries are chosen vessels who have burning in their breasts a spark of God-given fire. They go forth to scatter

it over the earth, and what would they but that it should be kindled ?

They are sharers in the Christ-yearning that "all men should be saved and come to the knowledge of the Truth". Hence they see in the hardships and dangers of missionary life nothing else than a baptism of sweat and blood where-with they must be baptised, and they are straitened until it be accomplished.

The obvious meaning of a Christian missionary is that he is a Truth-bearer and a Truth-planter. He takes out the Truth to the land of his destination, and his life-work is to plant it in the souls of the people. If less than that, or other than that, he is little better than a tourist or a trader in the land of the heathen.

Such, we take it, is the accepted idea and ideal of the missionary and the work of Christian missions.

And yet in view of Anglican enterprise in the East, one is led to doubt if this answer is completely up to date.

The new Anglican form of missions may be assumed to be all that we have described. But it is also something more than that.

It is marked off from the ordinary and older style of missions by some rather salient points of contrast.

First of all, the missions of which we speak are not directed to the heathen or the infidel. The people whom they have for their objective are certain bodies in the East who have been Christian from the times of the Apostles. They are Christian-to-Christian missions, as distinguished from those of the commonplace Christian-to-heathen character.

The reason why these Christian bodies need to have missionaries sent to them is that they have lapsed from the Catholic faith, and in the course of ages they have come to be decrepit, corrupt and debased.

If age could at all give to heresy beauty that is venerable instead of deformity that is wrinkled, these bodies could put in a very fair claim to our respect on the plea of antiquity. They are well-nigh as old as Primitive Christianity. Their connection with the Catholic Church ended before ours

began. Before St. Patrick had completed the conversion of Ireland, and long before St. Augustine had attempted that of England, they had already been into the Catholic Church and out of it.

They were expelled from the Church and deprived of Catholic Communion for holding and teaching errors which were fundamentally destructive of the doctrine of the Incarnation. They persisted tenaciously in their heresy, and have remained obdurate in their excommunication. Time has told the usual tale of the lopped-off branch. They have shrunk in numbers, and shrivelled in vitality. Their religious condition is avowed upon all hands to be an abnormally low one.

Nothing then more laudable or reasonable than that an effort should be made to lift them up to the level of Western purity and orthodoxy.

But there is a second point of contrast, and one in which the claim of the Anglican missions to originality is raised fairly beyond all reach of cavil or question.

Their object is *not* to convert those to whom it is sent. There is neither the wish nor the intention to make them Anglicans. The very idea of such a purpose is nervously deprecated, and anxiously disclaimed by the missionaries. The elementary notion by which a missionary going abroad was supposed to take his religion out with him and preach it when he got there, is thus frankly departed from. All ungracious friction is generously avoided. The Catholic status of the Eastern sects is courteously taken for granted. The fact, which to Catholics is a very plain one, that such bodies are—if General Councils mean anything—outside the Catholic Church, seems practically passed over or ignored.

No one doubts that such sects owe their very position and *raison d'être* to heretical revolt, and consequent excommunication. And yet the Anglican mission is apparently content to waive the point, and one cannot find in its *modus agendi* that any positive form of recantation or process of readmission to the body of the Church is either exacted or expected.

Was it, then, merely to stand by and watch the Easterns saying their prayers that these Anglican missionaries travelled out to Asia?

Not so.

These ancient Eastern sects are weak and feeble and persecuted. Anglicanism goes out to act the good Samaritan. They abound in the multitude of their wants. Anglicanism relieves them. They are old and decrepit. Anglicanism offers to nurse them. They are ignorant and illiterate. Anglicanism will instruct them. They have periodically fallen amongst Kurdish robbers, who have left them very much stripped and more than half-dead. Anglicanism hastens to pour wine and oil into their wounds—and if it also furnishes the “two pence” with the promise of whatever over and above is required, we need not regard such help as other than the practical seal of genuine compassion and charity.

Hence—if we understand it aright—the Anglican Church goes out to the sects of the East, not with a view to gather them into her fold. She only asks to be allowed to stand at their side as the ministering friend, whose hands are full of help and whose voice is full of sympathy.

The work is a gracious one, and no one will doubt that it is undertaken with genuine zeal and sincerity.

As a work of charity, such action is no more new than Christianity. But as a type of a Christian mission, one hardly knows where to look in the history of the Church for anything remotely resembling it.

A mission in which preachers who have no wish to convert, but put themselves in excellent working relations with listeners who have nothing to recant, opens quite a new and Arcadian chapter in the annals of missionary enterprise.

A notable illustration of this later form of mission—philanthropic, educational and diplomatic—is to be found in what is known as the Archbishop’s Mission to the Nestorian Christians of the East. Its annual reunion was held last month, and a further meeting on its behalf was presided over last week by the Archbishop of Canterbury.

The Nestorian body is chiefly remarkable as a survival of an unwontedly long-lived heresy.

In the year 428, Nestorius, Patriarch of Constantinople, began to teach heretical views of the Incarnation. He denied the personal unity of Christ, and the right of Our Blessed Lady to be called the Mother of God.

The heresy was a peculiarly deadly one, and tended to utterly undermine the Christian meaning of the Atonement. It held that the person who died for us on the Cross was not one and the same person as the Son of God. It implied thereby that the Atonement was the work of a man, and not the personal work of God, and, therefore, in value and efficacy, less than Divine.

The General Council of Ephesus, in 431, condemned Nestorius, and with him all the followers and abettors of his heresy.

The official statement made by the Council says:—

“Having convicted Nestorius of adulterating the faith by false and strange doctrines, and by artful forms of speech, we have degraded him from the priesthood, wishing to check his doctrine which, like a pestilence, has ravaged the churches.

“But, because we have discovered that certain Bishops are already vacillating, and are tainted by Nestorian opinions, and are even betrayed into his blasphemies, we have excommunicated all who share his doctrines, *until they have rejected his destructive teaching, and avow the Catholic and Apostolic Faith*, firmly fixed in which we all, henceforth, and from the beginning, obtain salvation.

“And this, indeed, we have decreed, that those who were led into error may, by this means, be corrected, and in the expectation that they will do penance” (Mansi, xiv., 1442).

We may add that one of the first acts of a Council of the early English Church—Hatfield, in 680—was to re-echo this condemnation pronounced by the Fathers of Ephesus, “anathematising all whom they anathematised” (Wilkins, i., 53).

For the return of Nestorius and many of his followers the Council and the Church waited in vain.

Unhappily, a considerable portion of the Church in Syria

made common cause with the condemned heretic, and shared in his excommunication. The Nestorians thus formed a distinct sect. They preserved their hierarchy and their liturgy, and became generally the "Old Catholics" of their period.

But, unlike the latter, they increased marvellously in numbers and energy. Although we may safely discount as Eastern exaggeration the statement that the Nestorian sect once outnumbered the whole bulk of Catholic Christendom, there can be no doubt that they were at one time possessed of vast missionary establishments throughout Asia.

But the hand of time and the infidel has been heavy upon them, and now after fourteen centuries of separated existence, the Nestorian Christians have dwindled down to a small group of 150,000 souls.

This historic remnant has been badly used by its neighbours. The Turks have oppressed it. The Kurds have despoiled it. In the hour of its need it turned its eyes towards England.

How the appeal has been answered is best described in the words of the Annual Report of the Anglican mission:—

In the year 1838 the Patriarch and his Bishops, in their helplessness and distress, sent to the Church of England a touching appeal for aid. In answer to this, successive Archbishops of Canterbury endeavoured to assist this ancient community, but no permanent work was established. In 1876, in consequence of an almost despairing appeal from the Assyrian rulers, the Rev. E. L. Cutts was despatched to Kurdistan on a mission of inquiry, the narrative of which is given in his interesting work, *The Christians under the Crescent* (S.P.C.K.). In 1884 the present Archbishop of Canterbury commissioned Mr. Athelstan Riley to undertake another inquiry. The result of these investigations was that the mission was fairly commenced in the summer of the year 1886, by the despatch of the Rev. Canon Maclean, M.A., and the Rev. W. H. Browne, LL.M., to Kurdistan. They were received with enthusiasm by the whole Assyrian Church and nation; Bishops and clergy rode out at the head of their people to welcome them, and the Patriarch placed the whole education of his flock in the hands of the English clergy.

The Apostolic simplicity of life which characterises the Nestorian Bishops and clergy who have received the Anglican mission is graphically described by one of the speakers at the Annual Meeting:—

“These people were not able to help themselves. They had one Bishop who worked in the fields with his own hands, and another Bishop, on whom he called, was not at home; he was taking his horse to the water.”

.

The action and scope of the Anglican mission are thus stated :—

The work of the mission is in the first place to train up a body of literate clergy; secondly, to instruct the youth generally in both religious and secular knowledge; and, thirdly, to print the very early liturgies and service-books, to which the Assyrians are much attached, which have never been published in the original, and of which the very primitive character is shown by their freedom from doubtful doctrine. The mission in no way seeks to Anglicanise the Assyrians on the one hand; nor on the other, to condone the heresy which separated them from the rest of Christendom, or to minimise its importance.

It is to be observed that the Archbishop of Canterbury, before sending out this mission, wrote expressly to the Patriarch of Antioch to assure him (as one of the speakers pointed out) that

“The object of the mission was not to proselytise, but to educate and instruct”.

.

At the same time the Archbishop assured the meeting held at Leeds that the missionaries neither proselytise on the one hand, nor religiously communicate with Nestorians on the other.

The Church Times thus reports his address :—

His Grace then went on to explain the nature of the mission and the objects at which it aimed. He was most careful to explain that not only was there no attempt to make Anglicans of Assyrian Churchmen, but that the mission clergy abstained from actual communion with those who were technically, though he was convinced not really, tainted with the heresy of Nestorius. The aim of the mission, undertaken in response to an appeal from the Catholics of the East, was to educate up an ignorant and feeble Church to a due understanding of its faith and liturgy, so that it might be able to resist the attacks of forces antagonistic to its continuance, whether Mohammedan, Roman or Protestant.

.

It is pleaded that the modern Nestorians are much too ignorant to know or to care anything about the theological disputes of the fifth century, and that the heresy condemned at Ephesus has no longer any conscious place in their convictions.

On the other hand, Anglicans agree with us that Continuity is a word to be written with a very large C. And if Continuity means anything, the Nestorian sect is the living and organised heir and representative of the heresy anathematised at Ephesus in 431. It is penance and absolution, and not mere lapse of time that remove an anathema.

It is equally true that the Nestorians still revere as a saint Nestorius, whom the Council anathematised as a heretic, and that their liturgy still excludes the word "Theotokos," which the Council insisted upon, and for the denial of which, in its true sense, Nestorius was excommunicated.

Here, then, we have before us the pieces of the puzzle which we have to fit together.

1. The Nestorian Christians of the East are a sect which is the living, and lineal, and historic descendant of a body excommunicated and anathematised by the General Council of Ephesus in 431.

2. They have never formally disavowed their heresy or repented of it, nor have they sought reunion or readmission to the Catholic Church.

3. They have preserved a liturgy expressive of their heresy in so far as the Catholic formulary, which corrects their heresy, is not accorded a place therein as in the other Eastern liturgies.

4. Nestorius, whom the Catholic Church at Ephesus cursed and condemned, is by them blessed and revered as a saint and martyr.

5. Anglicanism recognises the decrees of Ephesus as the authentic statement of Catholic faith.

6. It does not "condone" the Nestorian heresy.

7. But it educates the Nestorian clergy, and helps them to print their liturgy.

8. And the Archbishop recognises the Nestorians as "Catholics of the East," and therefore acknowledges the

sect to be an integral part of the Catholic Church. (Ephesus put them out. He puts them in.)

9. He forbids his missionaries to proselytise—which confirms the fact that he recognises the Catholic status of the Nestorians. (It would be their *duty* to proselytise, if he did not.)

10. But his missionaries are directed to “abstain from actual communion” with the Nestorians—which must mean that after all he does *not* recognise their Catholic status. For, if “fellow Catholics,” it would be an outrage against Christian charity to withdraw from their communion.

One cannot easily see how such puzzle-pieces could at all be made to fit. And if they could, the picture resulting from the adjustment would perhaps be more puzzling still. It might be one of Anglicanism, or it might be one of Nestorianism—or it might be a composite of both. What it certainly would *not* be, is one of Catholicity and the Council of Ephesus.

The perplexity of the problem and the incongruity of its factors ought not to lessen, but rather to deepen our appreciation of the zeal and generosity of those who have travelled so far over sea and land to attempt it.

“Great strides” made for Christ’s sake surely claim our sincere respect for the motives which urged them, even while as Catholics we witness with sorrow that they are made “not in the way”.

Visible unity, whether for East or West, postulates as its centre and source a visible *one*. If it be not the See of Peter, where should we look to find it?

It is a very long time since Anglicanism first began to make overtures to the Eastern Church. Any enterprising author who would “lay on the table” the entire correspondence between the two bodies would do a real service to contemporary religious history.

Such a return might do something to remove an impression which certainly exists amongst Catholics, that the wooing has been very much on one side, and that the suit has been far more persistent than successful. It would at least help us to understand why, after more than a century of intermittent effort, matters have never passed beyond

the stage which one of the Catholic Missionary Society's missionaries in Palestine rather contemptuously speaks of as "mere civilities".

Such advances made by Anglicanism to Eastern Christendom do credit both to its head and to its heart, and however much we may be convinced of the futility of such efforts, Catholics can certainly find something better to do than to make merry over the failure.

If Anglicanism could manage to calm down the antipathies and suspicions of the Eastern Church so that the two bodies might take their stand arm-in-arm on the common platform of solid intercommunion, the gain to both would be unequivocal.

The gain might probably be ours as well. They could hardly help each other at all without helping each other in our direction. Union makes for truth very much as truth makes for union. The more religious bodies unite and become cohesive, the more open they become to the grace of the Holy Spirit, and therein to Catholic influences—much in the same way that particles of matter coalescing in larger mass render themselves by the very fact more subject to centripetal attraction. There is a terrible law ever at work amongst the sects by which they themselves are condemned to prepare the way for the Church's victory. Either they must divide, and so, becoming weaker, hurry to their destruction, and get out of her path—or they must unite, and so, becoming nearer, become more likely to be happily drawn back into the centre of unity. Go or come, *vincit Leo de tribu Judah*.

Although no one would care to see the great Eastern Church alloyed with Anglican heresies, an union between Anglican and Eastern Christianity might, under certain respects, be productive of certain advantages.

Anglicanism would gain what—to our mind—next to Catholic truth it lacks most—dignity of antiquity and the majesty of numbers. On the other hand, the Eastern Church would gain what it certainly needs most, an infusion of Western culture and energy.

Anglicanism would have the Eastern Church at its back in its tug-of-war with low Evangelical Protestantism. The Eastern Church would have the moral support of an Anglican alliance against the inroads of fashionable scepticism and the murmurs of Eastern dissent. The Anglican would draw the Eastern out of his religious isolation, and the Eastern would lift the Anglican out of his religious insularity.

Better than all, each would have sympathetic confidences to impart to the other anent their experiences in the working of the theory of the Royal Supremacy in religion, and each would find in the other a counterpoise and a fulcrum of resisting power whenever a stand *came* to be made against the fiat of the Privy Council or the ukase of the Tsar or the decree of the Sultan.

We may never live to see it, but if a day should ever come when these two Churches at least join hands, we feel sure that in doing so they will be found, much to their own surprise, no doubt, facing Romewards, and looking, if not moving, to the great Apostolic Chair, from which they both are truant children of the days gone by.

At the same time, in dreaming of such a contingency, it is but fair to take into view the considerations which would tell in the direction of incompatibility, and might go to make the yoke an unhappy or even an intolerable one for the parties concerned. It is a question of sounding as far as we can the heart of one of the factors to be united, and of ascertaining as clearly as we can the genuine feeling, tone and temper of Eastern Christianity.

CHAPTER XXX.

Eastern Christianity.

PROBABLY no one has attempted that task of introspection with more earnestness and success than Mr. Athelstan Riley. He may be said to be the patron, and in some measure the pioneer, of the Archbishop of Canterbury's Mission to the Assyrians, of which mention is made above.

To arrive at an authentic and personal knowledge of the Eastern Church, he resolved to go straight to Mount Athos—the Lhassa of Orthodoxy, the wonderful monastic holy land, which is regarded as the home and the sanctuary of the best traditions of Oriental Christianity. Passing from monastery to monastery, he was enabled to have under his eyes, and at first hand, and at their source, the actual beliefs and practices which radiate therefrom throughout the whole pale of Eastern Christendom. He has embodied his impressions in an able and charming volume—*Athos, or the Mountain of Monks*—a work which Catholics are sure to read with deep interest, not unmixed with consolation.

We cannot do better than take this earnest Anglican author for our witness in seeking to set in relief certain points on which it seems to us that the course of Anglican and Eastern love might fail to run smooth.

There are certain well-known Anglican dislikes. In some cases they coincide with Eastern likes and observances.

For instance, the Anglican has sometimes a quasi-patriotic dislike of what is known as Italianism in devotion, and especially that which finds its consolation in effusive prayers and “miraculous Madonnas”.

(As a matter of fact, the sobriety which he conceives to be English, is very often nothing more than a certain stiffness which comes from being Protestant, and which is in truth very un-English, for it may be doubted if any prayer of St. Alphonsus or hymn of Father Faber is at all so tender or effusive as such truly English compositions as the “Wooing of Jesus” or the “Prayers of St. Anselm,” and many others which formed for centuries the popular devotions of the English people before the Reformation.)

However, here it seems that he has the Eastern against him.

In almost every monastery of the Eastern Church is to be found a miraculous Icon or picture of Our Blessed Lady, or the “Mother of God,” as the Easterns prefer to call her. Thus in the account of the monastery of Vatopedi, we find the following description:—

“Behind the altar . . . is an ancient Icon of the Blessed

Virgin, before which is a large candlestick. The story goes that, in the ninth century, during the irruption of the Saracens, the Icon and the lamp which burned before it were put down into a well for safety. Many years afterwards, when the hidden treasure was hauled up again, the lamp which accompanied it was found to be still burning. The light is now enclosed in the large candlestick, and a lump of wax placed near the wick keeps it continually alight."

And again :—

"In a little passage which runs between the narthex and the paraclesia of St. Demetrius is an Icon of the Virgin which is said to have called one day to the Empress Pulcheria, as she was going to her devotions in the great church, saying, 'What do you, a woman, here? A queen you are, it is true, but there is another queen here. Depart from this church, for women's feet no more shall tread this floor.'"

Again :—

"In the narthex of the Chapel of Demetrius is another miraculous Icon, about which we were told the following story. A deacon being late for supper was refused his usual commons; wandering sulkily about the courtyard he entered the church, and in a fit of anger struck his knife into the painting of Our Lady on the wall, when to his horror blood issued from the wound and slowly trickled down the picture. Instantly moved to repentance, he spent three years in a little open cupboard (which still exists) opposite the picture." At his death "the Holy Virgin had appeared to him in a dream, and told him that she would forgive *him* but would never forgive his *hand*. This hand is still preserved in a box and was shown to us."

The above are but a few straws from the sheaf, but we doubt if anything stronger could be found in the annals of Western hagiography. Even an Italian friar or a Roman sacristan would hardly have cared or dared to make such a demand upon Anglican faith as did these abbots and monks of Mount Athos.

Can any one imagine these fervid Easterns brought into

Church unity with such Anglicans as make up the staple of the Protestant Alliance or the Church Association?

The following, for instance, is a ceremony at which—in the event of the union of the two Churches—persons like Lord Grimthorpe or the Anglican Bishop of Liverpool might be called upon to assist:—

“At the conclusion of the Office, a richly jewelled Icon of Our Lady, which hung near the top of the Iconostasis, was slowly let down in front of the holy doors. The Abbot Maccarius stood before it on the platform or *soleas* of the Iconostasis; two priests stood on each side of him towards the picture, facing each other, and two deacons, with silver censers in their hands, also facing each other, nearest the picture. Then the Abbot, taking a book and holding it up close to his face, commenced to intone a long litany, each petition being about four times the length of those in the litany of the English Prayer-book, and the burden of it ‘Hail,’ a word which occurred (say) six times in each petition, and the only word we could understand, the language being Slavonic.

“At the end of each of these sentences, the Abbot and his two priests crossed themselves and bowed very low, whilst the deacons turned and incensed the Icon, the choir meanwhile chanting a threefold ‘Lord have mercy,’ a doxology, or an ‘Alleluia’.

“This curious service lasted for the best part of an hour, without any variation, and then two monks advanced and supported the picture in their arms between them, leaning it on their shoulders: and first the Abbot and then the priests and deacons, after prostrating themselves thrice, touching the ground with their foreheads each time, advanced and kissed the Icon, and prostrated themselves again. All the monks and lay people followed, and the poor old Russian merchant knocked his head upon the ground so often and so vehemently that we began to fear each prostration would be his last. The Icon, a modern one, was, we were told, miraculous, and came from Jerusalem.”

Anglicans meditating reunion would no doubt put down such scenes to the ignorance or enthusiasm of the monks,

and look for relief to the culture of the higher authorities that preside over the Eastern Churches. But even here there are many to whom the following declaration of Mouravieff, Procurator of the Holy Governing Synod, would be less than reassuring:—

“We agree . . . that our duty is to glorify by every possible means her whom the Almighty has invested with majesty, and whom, according to the Gospel, all generations must call blessed. We agree that this is a holy work and the duty of every Christian. This the Orthodox Church does. Since the earliest ages of Christianity she has glorified the Blessed Virgin, naming her more precious than the Cherubim, and infinitely more glorious than the Seraphim, supplicating her as the most powerful *Mediatress* with the Lord and the mightiest advocate of the Christian world.” Nor is this to be dismissed as an irresponsible utterance. In the Euchologion or official service-book used in Russia, Our Lady is addressed over and over again as the “*Mediatrix*” of the Christian people.

In the above we have tried to measure only at one point the difference which separates the Anglican and the Eastern mind. There are other points where the distance is certainly not less, and in which the mental friction—not to say antagonism—of temperament would be indefinitely greater. For the present, we may carry away from the perusal of Mr. Athelstan Riley’s work the impression that Anglicanism will hardly find itself more devotionally at home if ever it seeks to say its orisons before an Orthodox Icon rather than before a Western Madonna.

At all events, when it has learned to join in the Abbot’s litany and has accepted the Procurator’s declaration it will not have been badly schooled or ill prepared to understand St. Alphonsus Liguori and to assist at any of our Catholic devotions.

A few more points of unlikeness between the systems of Anglican and Eastern Christianity are the following:—

Anglicanism has a rooted objection to new definitions of faith. It regards them as excrescences and corruptions,

and insists on the sufficiency and finality of the fifth century Creeds and Councils. The matter of such definitions is not more hateful than their origin. The Roman Communion, albeit but a part of the Church, presumes to speak and act as if it were the whole. Worse still, a powerful and intolerant faction within that communion (the Jesuits!) succeeds in having its favourite theological beliefs patented into dogmas and thus forced upon the assent of their co-religionists. Such a spectacle of spiritual tyranny is quite enough to make angels as well as Anglicans weep. We, who, after all, are more nearly concerned in the misfortune, would willingly weep with them tear for tear could we only bring ourselves to believe that such abuses have any substantial existence. We are inside—not outside—the house in which these wrongs are supposed to be perpetrated. And—like the majority of those who formed the Councils in which they were perpetrated—we fail to discover any proof of their reality. Can we forget that some of the Sacred Ecumenical Councils of antiquity which Anglicans regard with loving veneration were clothed as with an outer garment of human parties and passions in which partisan feelings had spun their usual texture of clique and intrigue, until they seemed that, and nothing but that, in the eyes of outsiders? Yet underneath was the work and the voice of the Holy Ghost. What was true of Ephesus might surely be true of Trent and the Vatican. Here, however, the root-difference between the Anglican view and our own lies deeper down, and is one not merely of fact, but of system.

To us the law that the truths contained in the Gospel must be progressively developed and defined is just as obvious as that the Gospel itself should be possessed and professed by all Christians. Hence the definitions of faith, marking the centuries, are to Catholics the natural and necessary process of doctrinal evolution. Any arresting of its progress, or any limitation of its working to the first few centuries would be to us as inconceivable as the suspension of a vital function in a Church which lives with a life that is enduring and Divine.

To take an instance in detail.

We are convinced that Catholics from the beginning believed the Church of God upon earth to be "infallible". ("The pillar and the ground of Truth" was only a longer but a stronger and more graphic way of putting it.) We are not less convinced that Catholics from the outset held that Christ had invested St. Peter and his successors with a teaching supremacy.

But an Infallible Church plus Papal Supremacy equal Papal Infallibility.

He who is supreme teacher of a Church which is infallible cannot, in so far as he supremely determines its teaching, be less infallible than the Church which he thus teaches.

Hence to us doctrinal development is nothing more than the logic of dogma in the mind of a living Church.

.

A Church which taught two such premises as the above was bound, by the force of its own mental coherency, sooner or later to reach the only possible conclusion. A Church which held in her mind two such truths could not live and think without one day feeling them unify and flow into one, any more than a teacher can instruct his class that a triangle is the juxtaposition of three straight lines without eventually telling them that the angles enclosed equal two right angles.

.

Quite true, the conclusion, in its definite form, has taken centuries to reach. That only means that it marks an advanced point in the path of doctrinal evolution, and that doctrinal evolution, like all other evolutions, is the work of the ages. The very fact that it does so has its part in strengthening our conviction. The result of the evolution comes before us in the historic procession of the dogmas, in the long continuous line which reaches from the Homousia at Nicæa to the Papal Infallibility at the Vatican. It is headed by the group of Incarnation truths which set forth our Lord's Divinity and the reality of His Body. Then follow the truths which deal with the same Body in the Eucharist as at Lateran and at Trent. That the truths

which treat of His Mystic Body, the Church and her constitution, should come later and not sooner (as at Trent and the Vatican); is to us a further guarantee of the Divine logic which is at work in giving to the procession order and movement. Such a procession marshalled across the centuries carries to a Catholic mind a conviction of Divine Authorship with much the same force that the continuity of plan in the progressive evolution in nature postulates to the mind of the theist an enduring God ever at work within it and behind it.

It was this logic of faith working in the mind of the Church at large which brought forth its fruit in due season in the Vatican Council, and the smooth and natural way in which its decree was unanimously accepted by a world-wide episcopate could only be explained on the supposition that it formulated into words a conclusion that the body of the Church felt to be part of the faith, and that thus the decree itself was the child and the outcome of the Church's inward conviction.

Such, at least, we take it, is the work of dogma-making as seen from the inside.

Undoubtedly, Anglicans sincerely believe that such a process started—at least at some point after the fifth century—upon false lines and from false premises. But in that case their quarrel should be with the premises, and not with the process of dogmatic development, which does nothing more than draw the conclusions, and which they themselves recognise to have been lawfully at work in the great Councils of the first five centuries.

However, we have only here to consider whether if Anglicanism looks or moves eastward it will find in its path any such obstacles as “doctrinal developments” of Eastern origin.

We take a specimen, presented in the work on Mount Athos by Mr. Athelstan Riley.

It is only fair to remember that the case we give is not the making of “dogma” strictly so called, and so far the analogy may be open to question. But it is a case of doctrine developed, defined and enforced under anathema,

and as such we presume that most Anglicans would be disposed to discount the practical importance of the distinction.

An abbot named Simeon, who lived in the eleventh century at Constantinople, taught his monks a new method of contemplation. They were to remain "alone in their cells, shutting the door, and seating themselves in the corner". With their beards resting on their breasts, they were to "turn their eyes with all possible concentration of thought upon the middle of their stomachs".

The sequel of the abbot's instructions is somewhat more difficult:—

"Then holding thy breath, and taking no respiration either through the mouth or nose, search thy entrails for the place of the heart, which is the seat of all the powers of the soul. At first thou wilt find naught there but thick shadows and darkness hard to dispel, but if thou dost persevere, continuing this practice night and day (without respiration?) thou wilt find a marvellous thing, a joy without interruption, for as soon as the spirit has found the seat of the heart, it will see that which it has never known before, and it will see the air which is in the heart, and will see itself luminous and easy of discernment."

That might fairly be dismissed as mystic, monkish nonsense, or an anticipation of certain forms of hypnotism.

But the advocates of this introspective contemplation went very much farther. They identified their new-found light with that which shone in our Lord's Transfiguration.

Whereupon arose a mighty controversy which convulsed the whole Eastern Church for nearly a hundred years, and turned the theological schools into camps, something after the manner of the great Western debate *de Auxiliis*.

A learned monk called Barlaam denounced the Transfigurationists as heretics.

On the other hand, Gregory Palamas, afterwards Archbishop of Thessalonica, became their champion.

Now for the result.

"Barlaam appealed to Constantinople, and after no less than four Councils had been held, he was finally condemned,

and the doctrine of the Uncreated Light was declared to be a Christian Verity. This took place in 1351."

Moreover, Gregory Palamas is still honoured with a commemoration in the services of the Second Sunday of Lent, while Barlaam (who subsequently became a Catholic) had his opinions denounced amongst the heresies which are solemnly anathematised on "Orthodoxy Sunday".

These sanctions still remain enshrined in the formularies of the Greek Church, and although the office of Gregory Palamas is forbidden in the immediate neighbourhood of Constantinople, an Archimandrite assured Mr. Riley that "the Uncreated Light is a true and orthodox belief, but not a dogma".

The decree thus elicited from the Eastern Church on this point is certainly a marvel in the matter of definition.

To attempt an analysis. It consists of three parts.

The first condemns an error. The second condemns the opposite error. The third states the *Via Media* or orthodox belief. We mark these A, B, C.

(A) To them that think and say that the light which shone from our Lord in His Holy Transfiguration was either an appearance and a creature, and a vision that appeared for a little time and was forthwith dissolved.

(B) Or else the very essence of God, as wholly and to the loss of their souls, throwing themselves into two contrarities and impossibilities.

And on the one side holding the madness of Arius (who divided the one Godhead and the one God into things created and uncreated).

And on the other, carried away with the impiety of the Massalians (who say that the Divine substance is visible).

(C) And confess not, according to the inspired teaching of the Saints and the pious belief of the Church, that that most Divine Light was *not a creature, nor the essence of God*, but an *uncreated* and physical grace, and forthshining and energy which ever inseparably proceedeth from the Divine essence itself—

Anathema, Anathema, Anathema.

According to this definition, the Light seen on Thabor

1. Was *not* a creature.
2. Was *not* the Divine essence.
3. Was uncreated.

No. 2 is, of course, Catholic doctrine, for the effulgence on Thabor was not the Beatific Vision. But to Anglicans meditating Eastern reunion, we may leave the problem how No. 2 is to be reconciled with No. 3. One utterly fails to see how the ingenuity of even the Eastern intellect can discover a middle term between the Created and Uncreated, the Creator and the Creature.

Compared with the above, the solutions to be found along the whole line of Western doctrinal development are plain, practical and divinely precise. Anglicans might search our synodical collections in vain for anything so utterly bewildering and impossibly metaphysical as this formula of the Uncreated Light, which issues as the result of the wisdom and authority of the Orthodox Church. The solution is immeasurably more difficult than the original question. It took four successive Councils to arrive at this eonic resultant between the created and the Uncreated. It would take forty times four such Councils to explain how such a resultant could either exist or be conceived!

Another basis of Anglican objection is sometimes to be found in the Roman use of what is known as *economia*.

To many the word seems to connote something which is crooked, unprincipled or shuffling. To the English mind law is law, and justice is justice, and both should be straightforwardly, openly, fearlessly and impartially administered.

In contrast to this, the Roman Church, it is said, has a way of bending her laws or principles for considerations of convenience under plea of "economy".

That would indeed be a serious charge if it were true, but this, we take it, is one of the many things which are better understood when seen from within. So considered, *economia* turns out to be one of the most wise and reasonable, and most graceful features in the Church's government.

What does it mean?

Literally, it means the Church's maternal tact in the management of her household.

Let us project an illustration across the pale.

Let us suppose that the Archbishop of Canterbury, before delivering his recent Judgment, had good reason to believe that his decision would be vehemently opposed, and therefore wisely delayed its deliverance, even beyond the legal limits, until heated public opinion would have time to cool down for reflection. His action would be *economia*.

Or if the Archbishop found in his province a recalcitrant Bishop, who gainsaid his authority, he might wisely determine, before putting the law in force, to exhaust the resources of conciliation. Before dealing with his suffragan in the hardness and harshness of legal writs and processes, the Archbishop might seek, in a pastoral spirit, to open up personally, or by third persons, non-official relations with him, and so to talk matters over, as bring him to a better frame of mind, and thus avoid the friction and scandal of litigation.

Such side-action, outside the hard line of official channels, would be *economia*.

Or if the said Archbishop were involved in the crisis of a struggle with an iniquitous Government, and finding open resistance unavailing, while safeguarding principles, and keeping himself staunchly from all trimming and compromise, were to use the wisdom of waiting, and bide his time until the storm passed over, knowing that statesmen are wont to die while the Church remains, such a policy would be another form of *economia*.

So, too, within the Church, the Holy See keeping steadily in view the good of souls, and the peace of the Church, has been unfaltering and unflinching where principles are at stake, but full of Apostolic economy in its dealings with men and the rulers of men. The reconciliation with the Uniates proves that where souls are within reach the Church can waive questions—not of faith or of morals—but of mere ecclesiastical discipline or liturgical uniformity to gather

them into the fold of her unity. The history of her action, both in East and West, bears plentiful witness to such wise exercises of her *economia*.

The Divine law, proceeding as it does from the heart-searching mind of God, is adapted to the needs and circumstances of all men without exception.

Hence, in it, the Church teaches there can be no *economia* and no dispensation. But ecclesiastical law—the modes and methods which the Church herself has erected to scaffold the fulfilment of the Divine law—is Church-made, and is, by the fact, under Church control. Proceeding from the mind of a human legislator, it can only gauge broadly the good and the need of the majority of her community. In the minority will ever arise individual and exceptional cases, in which the enforcement of the law would make for wrong instead of for right, for hardship and not for happiness. Such cases, when duly verified, the Church meets by the use of the dispensing power—the rational accompaniment of every human law—and such adaptations or bending of the general law, which she herself has made, to the individual need of her children, is one of the commonest and most gracious forms of her *economia*.

Is there anything corresponding to this *economia* in the East?

Apparently yes. But of a kind almost as perplexing as the definition of the “Uncreated Light”.

The Greek Church declares that trine immersion is necessary to the validity of baptism.

Hence it would seem that to the mind of the Greek Church neither Catholics nor Anglicans are validly baptised.

It is obvious that such a belief is murderously destructive of the “Branch Theory”. It strangles it at its very birth. The Greek cannot be expected to treat us as “branches” of the Church if we are not even yet members of it.

As a consequence, if we wish to become members of the Greek Church, we should have to submit to be rebaptised.

But here comes in a sort of geographical *economia*.

The *Russian Church* will receive a Western—whether Catholic or Anglican—*taking him as if he were baptised*—and merely adding chrism by way of confirmation.

More than that, the *Russian Church* is in full communion with the Greek, so that once in its pale we could pass into full membership with the Eastern.

Thus, as Mr. Riley very well describes it, a Western who objects to being rebaptised will find the economical way to Athens or Constantinople by passing through St. Petersburg.

Another not less wonderful but truly Byzantine instance of Eastern *economia* is to be found in the recent decision of the Holy Synod of Greece convened to make due arrangements for the reception into the Greek Church of the Princess Sophia.

The Synod, after due consideration, held unanimously that when converts were received from Latin or Lutheran Communion rebaptism should be insisted upon. Secondly, that in the case of the Duchess of Sparta, *owing to her exalted station*, this law might be dispensed with “by economy,” and the administration of chrism deemed to be sufficient.

It is a relief to learn that the Metropolitan of Athens proposes to make a stand against this shameful interpretation of *economia*.

The following explanation accorded by a Greek Archbishop to Mr. Riley, throws still more light on the Eastern meaning of *economia*. Having laid down the rule that a Catholic (even the Pope himself), if he sought admission to the Greek Church would have to consent to be rebaptised, he added: “Still, supposing the *whole* Latin Church and its Patriarch were to submit to us in a body, then the Church, by an exercise of the *economy of the Church* would recognise Western baptisms and ordinations, and they would become *valid by the mere act of recognition*”.

That is surely high theological discount for wholesale quantities! We feel sure that a research into the authentic teaching of the Orthodox Church would give us a higher estimate of its theology.

Thus we may note that Eastern *economia* is something widely and vastly more far-reaching than anything known under that name in the West.

The Popes have done mighty and magnificent things in their day "*ex plenitudine Apostolicae potestatis*," but not even Innocent or Hildebrand ever so much as dreamt that they could make Sacraments valid and *in globo* by a "mere act of recognition".

As a plea for ecclesiastical omnipotence, no Petrine claim can be at all compared to it.

It would be surely both an idle and ungracious thought if we imagined that we could in any way heighten the lights which beam upon Rome by painting somewhat more deeply the shadows which have fallen upon the venerable Churches of the East. Our task is merely to point out certain facts and ask ourselves a question:—

If Anglicanism is animated with a dislike of exaggerated assumption of Church power and prerogative, and if it objects to what it deems an unprincipled use of them, whether at Rome or at home, whether by doctrinal definitions or economical policies, will it not have gone farther to fare very much worse if it ever should turn its eyes from the Rock to seek solace and fellowship in Constantinople?

CHAPTER XXXI.

An Invitation to Take Part in Anglican Worship.

(22ND AUGUST, 1891.)

WHAT should be the attitude and action of an Anglican clergyman to Roman Catholics who reside in his parish?

The question is one of some delicacy and interest, and *The Church Review* of last week devotes an article to discussing it, and to suggesting a solution.

The article may be said to be in some measure addressed to us, and we gather from the following clause that the writer appeals rather to us than to the Anglican clergy:—

"But it is not so much our own brethren that we can remonstrate with as the Roman Church that we can advise".

Unhappily, the advice is not one that a Roman Catholic could for a moment accept without ceasing to be either Roman or Catholic, but it is undoubtedly well meant, and as such merits to be treated with the same courtesy and candour with which it is given.

The advice thus given to the Roman Church is to the effect that Roman Catholics, especially in isolated districts, should not be prohibited from attending the Anglican Church and availing themselves of the services of the Anglican clergy.

One has only to read so far to feel that the writer is still very much unacquainted with the principles of the Church whom he is advising. That will go to explain why the concession proposed may very possibly seem to him one that is small and reasonable, while to us it belongs to a class which could not even be entertained.

The advice is given, no doubt, with excellent motives from the standpoint of the adviser. But to us who stand within the pale of the Church for whom it is intended, the writer is unconsciously advising the Roman Church to unchurch herself, and to reverse all those principles which have guided her action from the time of the first century heresies to the present day.

We feel that the demand is an impossibly large one. But when we have said so, we hasten to admit that it is couched in terms of singular moderation.

For instance, we should have thought that in framing such a proposal the writer would have recognised that there are between Anglicans and ourselves certain differences of religious belief which would have to be reckoned with before discussing any possibility of Catholics sharing in Anglican worship. Strangely enough, dogmatic differences and the antagonism of conscientious convictions are not even alluded to.

Assuredly those who know most of the Roman Church will know best that these form about the last consideration, which, in dealing with her, could be waived or left out of the question.

In her view, any mere material commingling of Anglicans and Catholics under one church roof or in the voice of church praise, while their minds were not welded in the unity of dogmatic belief, would be a combination at once unreal, unprincipled, hypocritical and fictitious.

These differences of belief exist and stand very plainly in the way. However, the article walks round them, and passes straight to the question of recourse to Anglican ministrations.

Even here the proposal is put with much gentleness.

It is not urged that Catholics who have their own clergy and churches conveniently close to them should abandon them for those of the Establishment. The plea is mainly made to meet the case of derelict Catholics who find themselves in districts in which they are practically out of reach of the Catholic priest, and at an inconvenient distance from the Catholic altar. It is pleaded that these should be allowed to seek what they require at the hands of the Anglican ministry!

But we had better allow the writer to put the case in his own words:—

There is one very difficult question which must present itself at times to every parish priest who is zealous for the fulfilment of his ordination vows, and is anxious to bring all such as are, or shall be, committed to him “unto that agreement in the faith and knowledge of God, and to that ripeness and perfectness of age in Christ that there be no place left either for error in religion or for viciousness in life”. This question is, “What is the parish priest’s duty to his Romanist parishioners?” Much is written and said about our duty to Dissenters. Our duty by our own Church people is plain and clear enough, but besides these there are now in most parishes in England a few (and sometimes not a few, but many) parishioners, baptised Christians, who are taught to reject the ministrations of the Church of England, but cannot always obtain the ministrations they desire. The position of a poor Romanist, whether Irish or foreigner or English, placed in a country village with no means of grace such as he or she can accept near, is painful and difficult.

Now it is important that such difficulties should not be stated vaguely or in the abstract. They should be set forth graphically and in the concrete. Wherefore, the writer very

wisely makes a point of illustrating his meaning by one or more typical examples. We take it that his general contention is that Catholics are placed at a spiritual disadvantage when living at a great distance from their church and clergy. That is undoubtedly true, and we must in fairness remember that it remains so, if the following example chosen by the writer should strike us as being just the reverse of a happy one:—

Let us take two or three instances, which are founded, not on fancy but on fact. A poor Irishwoman, a devout Roman Catholic, marries an Englishman and settles in a village far from any chapel of the Roman obedience. She has a young family, and she cannot afford a conveyance. She is told that it is a mortal sin to go out without being churched after childbirth. She cannot get to a church of her own, though the parish church is a few doors off. She has not the strength to walk six or eight miles to Mass (especially fasting). The parish church is, as we have said, almost next door, and the "Lord's death is shown forth" every Sunday there. Does it not seem harsh in the Roman Church to tell that poor woman that she is in peril of her soul if she does not use the means of grace? And yet she cannot get them, unless she accepts them from an Anglican priest.

Despite the warning that the above instance is founded not on fancy but on fact, a Catholic will feel strongly tempted to doubt the main factors of the difficulty.

"She is told that it is a mortal sin to go out without being churched after childbirth." But who can have told her? Is it meant that the mother cannot "go out" (namely to church) until she has been churched? If so, her position would indeed be one of dilemma, for if she cannot "go out" until she is churched, it is equally hard to see how she can be churched until she goes out. Churching at home is more or less of a contradiction in terms, and generally unknown to Catholic practice. But after all, the way out is sufficiently simple. Does the mother never go to this church of her own, which is six or eight miles off? If never, the term "devout" is a misnomer, and the want of churching is but the least part of the evil to be remedied. But if otherwise, she will sooner or later find her way thither to Mass, and the officiating priest will undoubtedly church her before or after the service.

We think that the "devout Irishwoman" would be of all

people the most likely to see her way swiftly and straightly to the orthodox solution.

On the other hand, we suspect that there might be some warmth in her words to those who might propose to her the "parish church solution".

Then why should she go "fasting"? We cannot think of any rite of the Church which requires the receiver to be fasting save Holy Communion.

But, finally, there really cannot be any question of "mortal sin," or any other sin, in the matter.

Catholic mothers from the earliest times have been invited to follow the example of the Most Blessed of all Mothers, and re-enter into the precincts of public worship by a ceremony of thanksgiving and the conducting blessing of the priest. But certainly the Church does not conceive such a rite to be of necessity, and—to their honour be it said—the ready devotion of those for whom it is meant has never been of a kind which could have needed legislation or penalties to prompt it.

So far from the ceremony of "churching" being an obligation binding under pain of "mortal sin," it is not even an obligation at all. Throughout the Catholic Church it is known and practised simply for what the Roman Ritual itself describes it, namely, "a blessing," which, "according to a pious and praiseworthy *custom*," is to be given by the priest to her "who wishes to come and to ask for it". Readers of St. Bede will remember how Pope Gregory the Great, in his instruction to St. Augustine of Canterbury, expressly repudiates the notion of its being in any way binding. And in the olden time, when the English Catholic mother, enveloped in her white veil and carrying a lighted torch in her hand, came to the door of her parish church, with a matron friend standing at either side, and knelt to be sprinkled with holy water, and hear the Church's sweet words of welcome, "*Come into the temple of God, that thou mayst have life everlasting*," the very service-book which the priest held in his hand placed under his eyes the injunction that women might be churched "any time when they wished

to come," and "entry into the Church was not to be denied them".

Or to express it in the words of a mediæval book of instructions for the laity: "Whan wymen be delyvered of ther children, they may entre holy chirche to thank ther God what tyme they wyll or may, the law letteth (hinders) them not" (Maskell's *Monumenta*, vol. i., 47).

As far as we can gather, neither in England nor out of it, before the Reformation or after it, was the ceremony ever held to be of binding obligation.

Hence the picture of the devout Irish woman menaced "with mortal sin" and "in peril of her soul" because she cannot get churched is one which we take to be—*pace* the writer—founded rather on fancy than on fact.

The second example may or may not be more probable, but is hardly more conclusive:—

Take another instance. A foreign family take work in an English village. They are devout Bretons. They like and are accustomed at home to go to Mass every Sunday. After their week's work it is hard to have to walk many miles to a Roman chapel. The parish church, as beautiful as (from an English standpoint more beautiful than) the church they had in their Breton home, is close by. They hear the church bells. "*C'est le même Dieu,*" say the Bretons, and they go to the Anglican Church and listen to the music, and join as well as they can in the service. So they accept the religion of the land in which they dwell.

Here the Catholic Breton is pictured as swayed by three arguments.

First, the Roman Church is far off. Second, the English Church is a beautiful building. Third, the same God is worshipped in both.

We have always loved to believe that Anglicanism marked itself off from Evangelical Protestantism by a deep sense of the sacredness of Church principles. Can the writer then seriously mean that it is desirable that Church principles should be settled by the nearness or farness of a place of worship, or the "inconvenience" of walking a few miles? Or does he mean that the worshipper is to decide his place of worship by the beauty of the external fabric? Truly

these are standards of thought and action far too vulgar and material that we could ever have expected to find them in the mind or the mouth of a High Church Anglican.

But "*C'est le même Dieu*"!

If the Bretons had emigrated to Turkey, and found themselves near to a mosque (a beautiful one!), they might have used precisely the same argument for joining in the Mohammedan worship, and saving themselves the trouble of walking to the Christian Church which might be at some miles' distance.

To use the words of the article. They would "have accepted the religion of the land in which they dwelt".

Or to seek an illustration nearer home, a party of Anglicans fishing or shooting in Scotland go and take part in Dissenting or Presbyterian worship. The Anglican Church is far off, and "*C'est le même Dieu, n'est-ce pas?*"

Are we to understand that *The Church Review* would approve of that?

It would be idle to plead lack of analogy on the score that Anglicans do not believe the Dissenting clergy to be priests or to have valid Sacraments.

Anglicans are not likely to be more firmly convinced of that in the case of the Dissenter than Catholics are convinced of it in the case of the Anglican.

From the point of view of the worshipper, there is, therefore, clearly involved the same contemptible breach of principle in the one case as in the other. It becomes neither Anglicans nor ourselves to advocate or encourage it.

The third example carries into a much wider field:—

There is another, and in some parishes a large and growing section of our Roman Catholic parishioners with whom the duty of the Anglican parish priest seems clearer. We refer to those who have grave doubts as to the exaggerated claims of the Roman hierarchy, and are drifting into infidelity on account of their liberal views. A large portion of the Italians and Frenchmen who settle in England are of this class. Some of them, we know, are open infidels, many are little more than Deists; some, however, are merely dissatisfied with Vaticanism and Ultramontaniam, but not with Christianity or even Catholicism—they are Christians still,

and, in a way, Catholics ; but the hold of the Roman Church is very weak on them. We are certain that many of these are well affected to the Anglican Church. How far trying to convert them to our Church is admissible must be a moot point.

We think that how far it would be successful is a moot point also.

Frenchmen and Italians, like the people of other nationalities, are not all, and at all times, faithful and practical Catholics. But, perhaps more than certain other nationalities, they are nearly all wont to be intensely logical and keen-sighted in matters of religion. It is probably due to the inherited character of a Catholic people ; but, be the cause what it may, their minds are not of the comprehensive cast which can believe yes and no at the same time. A Frenchman, approached by this form of Anglican zeal, would probably take a copy of *The Church Review* in one hand, and the Thirty-nine Articles of Religion in the other, and spend most of his leisure in comparing them—or he is quite capable of having the sermons of the Bishop of Liverpool bound up in one volume with those of the Bishop of Lincoln, and, armed with this complex tome, he would probably proceed to tease himself and all his surroundings to find what cannot be found—the logical reconciliation between them.

Their manifold inconsistencies would furnish a source of endless delight to his analytic and epigrammatical temperament—if not to his *esprit railleur*—and we have a suspicion that his letters to his friends in Paris, detailing the results of his religious researches, would be just anything but pleasant reading for his Anglican missionary. Like all men, he may be open to the advantages of social conformity, but we venture to think, judging from what Catholics ordinarily feel, that, of all forms of religion, probably Anglicanism would be to him the most impossible.

It certainly would not give peace to his logical conscience, and, like his Italian brother, he would inevitably gravitate to Voltaire or the Pope.

Minds that have once been Catholic can never shrink into narrower systems or make their spiritual dwelling in the compromises of the Reformation. Men who have once seen

the face of Catholic truth, are likely thenceforth in their heart of hearts to be Catholics or nothing. Hence we find ourselves in complete agreement with the concluding sentence of the article—using, of course, the term Catholic in the only sense in which we can accept it:—

One thing is certain—they will never become Exeter Hall Protestants, nor followers of Pressensé or Gavazzi. It is only a Catholic that they would ever listen to, and only Catholic teaching that they would ever accept.

But there are other and obvious reasons which stand between the conscience of the Catholic and any participation in Anglican worship or ministrations.

We have discussed a proposal made by *The Church Review* to the effect that Catholics living in districts where they are far from their own church and clergy should be urged to take part in the services and ministrations of the Church of England.

The writer seeks to smooth the path of such Catholics to the Anglican Church by making an appeal *ad clerum*. It is addressed both to the Roman clergy and to his own.

He asks us, even for our own sake, not to be so stern in forbidding. Then he turns to suggest to the Anglican rectors and vicars that they possibly might be just a little less timid in inviting.

The part of the appeal which concerns us is worded as follows:—

The rigourist line of the Roman Church with regard to attendance at Anglican services is working harm to their own people. A more truly Catholic spirit would stop a sad leakage of the Roman Catholic poor of this country into infidelity, indifferentism, and even crime. If they had the Sacraments, and were supported by their clergy, they might do well; but, as it is, not being able too often to “go to their duties” as Catholics, they lose heart, and with it sense of responsibility.

But it is not so much our own brethren that we can remonstrate with as the Roman Church that we can advise.

The exhortation to the Anglican clergy is more vigorous:—

As a rule, it is a point of honour to refuse to proselytise among Romanists, although, of course, their clergy are eager to proselytise,

if they can, among our weak brethren. But may not our delicacy be sometimes carried too far? Has not the Anglican rector or vicar a legal and canonical responsibility for all in his cure? If poor souls are left languishing, thirsting, dying for means of grace, is he to refuse them those means because of etiquette, or because he dreads being brought into collision with the Roman clergy? There are tens of thousands of Romanists in England over whom the Roman Church has very little hold. Are these to be handed over to infidelity or carelessness without an effort to save them?

It is to be remembered that this plea is made *ad misericordiam* in behalf of poor Romanists.

“The position of a poor Romanist, whether Irish, or foreign, or English, placed in a country village with no means of grace such as he or she can accept, is painful and difficult.”

As far as our side of the question is concerned, such a proposal could hardly be taken seriously, and any answer from us thereto can hardly be said to be due or expected.

However, it may suffice if I endeavour to put into words the manner of response to such an invitation which would arise in the mind of any Catholic.

I only postulate that he is one who has kept his faith, and that he has not forgotten the first elements of his Catechism.

Let me cast myself into the position of the village Romanist in question.

I am a Catholic living in an out-of-the-way rural district. The nearest Catholic Church is more than ten miles away. As a result, I can go but seldom to Mass and yet more seldom to the Sacraments. It is plain that had I emigrated to the wilds of Australia or America I should have been spiritually at the same or even at a worse disadvantage. Here, as there, God will not take me to task for my whereabouts, and to him who does what in him lies, the Providence of grace will not be wanting.

But here comes in a point of difference.

I have the Anglican parish church next door to me. The vicar is one of the best and kindest of men. And to-day—Sunday morning—out of genuine pity for my spiritual isolation, he has come to invite me to go to his church, take part in its services, and avail myself of its ministrations.

Why not?

For the best and strongest of all reasons.

Because I am a Catholic. As such, I believe that the Catholic Church, in communion with the Apostolic See of Rome, is the one Church, the True Church, the only Church of Christ upon earth. The most absurd of superstitions would be to believe that Christ founded more than one Church. And the next greatest, which is like unto it, would be that Christ speaks as Teacher, through various Churches which are in conflict one with the other.

One God. One Christ. One Church.

A God made up of creatures is but one degree more impossible than a Church which is made up of sects.

The Church is the image of God.

Her unity reflects His absolute oneness.

Her Catholicity of "all nations" reflects His immensity.

Her Catholicity of "all days" reflects His eternity.

Her indivisibility and "seamlessness" reflect His simplicity.

Hence a "Church" which is a mere composite amalgamation of divided and hostile Churches—whether they call themselves "sects" or "branches"—whose dividedness is a concrete reality while their unity is a mental generalisation, can be to me just anything but the Church of Christ.

I believe in the Catholic Church. I do not believe in the Conglomerate Church.

That is a very roundabout way of answering the vicar.

Yes, but the time may not be lost if it sets clearly in relief one conclusion. Either a Catholic knows the meaning of his own faith or he does not. If he does not, he cannot do better than get his Catechism and learn it. But if he does, in knowing it there is nothing which he will know more firmly, see more clearly, and feel more deeply than the simple truth that as there are no Gods outside of the One True God, and no Christs outside of the One True Christ, so we can recognise no Church outside of the One True Church. Then beyond the pale of the Catholic Church—the living, organised Visible Body, of which I, as a Catholic, am

a member—there neither exists nor can exist any religious system which is not infidelity, heresy or schism.

To many ears that we would not willingly offend it may sound illiberal and exclusive to say so. Yet we must not be frightened by adjectives. God is illiberal enough to exclude all other Gods but Himself. Christ was illiberal enough to exclude all other Gospels but His own. When I say that two and two make four, Truth is illiberal enough to exclude all other solutions but that one. If the oneness of God, of Christ, and of Truth makes me as a Catholic exclusive, I feel that I am so in very good company. If the inclusiveness of Truth means the seemingly intolerant exclusiveness of all else than it, and if Truth should be true to itself as much in the religious as in the mathematical order, the responsibility lies with Him who made Truth, and not with us that hold it.

It follows that the duty of a Catholic is plain and peremptory.

He must hold as dearly as life itself the Catholic Truth which his faith has given him. And with not less faithfulness he must exclude from his mind, speech and outward action whatever is opposed to it.

That is the law which I, as a Catholic, must have in the midst of my heart when the Anglican vicar comes with genuine kindness and sympathy to offer me his invitation.

What does he ask?

He asks that I go to the Anglican Church and take part in the Anglican service.

But the Anglican Church, as a religious system, is condemned and excommunicated by the Catholic Church to which I belong. Its very Articles and formularies were framed in an act of disobedience to the Church. Its very existence at this moment in the land is a living and breathing and organised act of revolt against and rejection of the jurisdiction of the Holy See, which I, as a Catholic, believe to be of Divine Authority.

And the vicar asks me to join with it!

On one side I hear the voice of the Church, which condemns schism and heresy. As truly as she is the Church at all, so truly must she be in all times the Living Voice which Christ appointed to teach me and to guide me. To me, as a Catholic, that Living Voice is articulate in all ages, and has spoken in the Council of Trent and in the excommunications of the Pontiffs as truly as when it condemned the Arian at Nicæa or the Nestorian at Ephesus. Any system or sect thus condemned and excluded by the authority of the Church, I, as a Catholic, "hearing the Church," am bound to condemn and to keep myself aloof from it.

Here the voice of the Catholic Church is just as clear and as audible in my ears as the voice of the Anglican vicar. I can "hear the Church" or hear the vicar. I can obey either. But I cannot obey both. No man can move north and south at the same time.

Let me look at it more closely. Is it sinful to take part in this non-Catholic service?

I must practically say yes or no.

If I say no, I am not judging as a Catholic, for I say *no* where the Church says *yes*. The Church says, "You must not do it". I answer, "I shall". The Church says, "It is wrong". I answer, "It is right". If I could bring myself to deny and disobey after that manner, I should have begun to be my own teacher and my own guide, and have ceased to be, as every Catholic is, taught and guided by Christ's Authority speaking through the Church.

But if I say yes?

Then, I cannot go without violating the dictate of my conscience, and the vicar and with him every good Anglican would be the first to deplore such a deed, and, in proportion as they themselves are conscientious, they could not in their heart of hearts but heartily despise one for doing it.

But what is my position if I go?

I go there ostensibly to pray.

How shall I pray when I get there? My going and my worship is founded on an act of disobedience. I disobey God's Church in order to praise Him!

Shall I pray thus?

“Dear Lord, I have come here in spite of Thy law and command as delivered to me by Thy Church. I am here in the midst of a body who reject the authority of Your Church. I am here to honour Thee by joining in a system which Your Church has excommunicated. When I praise You, the formularies which shall be found in my mouth are those which Thy Church has condemned. I will honour and praise Thee by my disobedience and defiance of the authority of the Church, which my conscience tells me You commanded me ‘to hear,’ and of which You said, ‘He that heareth you, heareth Me, and he that despiseth you, despiseth Me’.”

That would not be the prayer upon my lips.

But it would be the prayer—the hypocritical insulting prayer—in which my actions would speak to God, and far more loudly than words could have spoken it.

But more plainly.

The Divine law of the faith requires that he who holds it shall never deny it, even outwardly or apparently.

My duty to faith demands that I shall hold what it holds, and condemn what it condemns.

All heretical and schismatical teaching and worship and religious fellowship are opposed to Catholic faith, and by the fact lie under its ban.

The Anglican worship is the organised and public expression of the Anglican beliefs and the Anglican doctrinal position. It is precisely by going to the Anglican Churches and taking part in the Anglican worship that men publicly profess their adhesion to one and the other. Hence, my presence and participation in the worship is *pro tanto* an outward profession or approval of Anglicanism and an outward denial of Catholicism. If I take part in it (even though in my inmost heart I believe all that the Church believes, and reject all that she rejects), I am guilty of an outward denial of Catholic faith. That means in plain English, I am acting as a renegade to the Church and a traitor to Christ. I am doing that which millions of martyrs suffered death rather than do.

In the Valerian persecution the noblest families of Rome could have saved themselves from exile, imprisonment and death by the simplest act of *outward* conformity with the national religion of Rome. To put a mere grain of incense in the censer at the temple, or to swear by the "fortune of Cæsar" as an expression of religious loyalty—a mere gesture or whisper of a moment—would have often been enough to satisfy their judges and restore them to their families.

The martyrs have shed their blood to bear witness that such things may not be done, and that to act otherwise is treason to faith, and to Him who has given it.

There was a period in our history here in England, after the death of Queen Mary, and during the earliest period of the reign of Elizabeth, when everything was largely in a state of doubt and transition and bewilderment, and when English Catholics asked themselves how far it was allowable, in view of the penalties by which they were threatened, to put in a formal appearance at the parish churches.

They sent a deputation to the Council of Trent. Pius V. gave a definitive sentence on it. The missionary priests, under Parsons, held a Synod here in England. Clement VIII. was further consulted on it. The Pope was called upon for a further judgment.

The answers given by the Church through all these authorities are unanimous. The Committee of Theologians at Trent pronounced unhesitatingly that no Catholic could lawfully assist at the Anglican rites. Laurence Vaux in writing to the Lancashire Catholics immediately after his audience with Pius V., tells us that "I am charged to make a defynytyve sentence that all such as offer their chyldren to the baptism nowe used or be present at the communion of service in the churches of Englande, as well the laytie as clergie, do not walk in the state of salvation, neyther we may not communicate or sociate ourselves in company with schismatyke or heretyke in devine things. There is noe exception or dispensation *can* be had for any of the laytie if they will stand in the state of salvacion."

The English Synod received and promulgated the Pope's decision. Cardinal Allen, as Delegate Apostolic, assured

the English Catholics that the practice was forbidden by the Divine law, and as such was not dispensable by even the power of the Pope. He had consulted Clement VIII. and heard from his own lips the judgment that "to participate with Protestants either by praying with them or coming to their churches" was against the law of God, and beyond the power of dispensation. Paul V. confirmed this decision with emphasis.

These decisions were obviously the affirmation and application of principles unfalteringly set forth in the earliest Councils of the Church.

Thus to English Catholics the Church has spoken repeatedly and plainly. Formal participation in a non-Catholic service is against the law of God. It is deadly sin. There is no power in the Church of God which could permit it. It is a treason to faith, and we are bound to suffer loss of property and even of life rather than be guilty of it.

So spoke the Church. So believed the faithful Catholics of this kingdom. So suffered the martyrs.

Hence the Anglican vicar may understand why it is to a Catholic a duty of conscience in all charity to say nay to his invitation. It would be still our duty to say it if there stood behind him a constable with a penal statute to enforce the invitation. It would be even our duty to say it with our blood, as so many of the martyrs have done, rather than be disloyal to the faith of which we are the unworthy witnesses.

However great then my spiritual destitution may be, owing to my living far from my church or clergy, it is certainly not by adding to my sins that of schism or external heresy that I can hope to relieve it.

Wherever my lot may be cast upon earth, and however bereft I may be of the consolations of the Mass and the Sacraments, at least as a Catholic there remain to me my faith and the membership of God's Church. I have the joy of feeling myself in communion with Holy Church throughout the world, and sharing in all her good works, and of knowing that I am one of the great world-wide family of which she is ever mindful in the sacrifice that ceases not from the "rising of the sun to the going down thereof".

Knowing that, I should feel myself to be spiritually richer in the midst of an African forest than a non-Catholic who worshipped in an English Cathedral.

Thus by accepting the vicar's invitation, though kindly meant, my "means of grace" would not be added to. On the contrary—that which in my spiritual poverty I have, and which I hold more precious than life—my faith and my loyalty to the Church would be forfeited.

Then, if we say no, it is in charity and in loyalty to conscience that we say so.

But is not our view of the Anglican and his worship a fearfully harsh one?

The vicar has left me.

To the voice of his pleading, and the voice of his church bells, I—the Romanist in the remote country village—must be inexorable. I see the congregation of old and young flocking to the old parish church. A little later, when the bells have ceased, I hear from where I stand the voice of their chants, and know that the vicar and his people are devoutly praising God in that service which he and they have known and loved from childhood.

What do I, as a Catholic, think of it?

Do I regard the worship offered by this people as anathema—as something banned by the Church as detestable and heretical, and therefore displeasing to Him to whom it is offered. Have I not said that all religion outside the Catholic Church is heresy and schism, and that it is deadly sin for the Catholic to take part in it?

That would, indeed, be a hasty and a harsh conclusion.

The value of worship depends on the mind and heart of the worshipper.

Under the roof of the old parish church are gathered no doubt a truthful and Christ-loving people. With hearts that are good and sincere they are joined together to worship their Creator and Redeemer. The service which they use is one which they love and revere as the service of His Church, and their voices and hearts go forth in its rendering.

God to whom such worship is offered looks into the hearts of the worshippers. He sees their good faith and sincerity. He sees their intention to adore and to praise Him. He knows that it is by no wilful fault of theirs that they are outside the visible fold of His Church. Such worship coming from such hearts cannot but be pleasing to Him, and cannot but win from Him that love which rewards with His graces here and His glory hereafter. Where prayer and praise go up from sincere and loving hearts, surely grace and blessing must come down upon them.

To see the force of what we mean the Anglican has only to look farther up the street. There is the Dissenting chapel. We look at that body of earnest men and women who are flushed and breathless with the zeal with which they have sung their opening hymn. Who shall say that *they* are not sincere, or that *their* worship is displeasing to God? I have precisely the same reasons to believe in their sincerity—and therefore in the acceptance of their worship—as I have in the case of the congregation in the parish church.

Yet I take it a good High Church Anglican would hold that in this chapel worship is schismatical, and such that loyal Anglicans may not lawfully join in it.

We might apply the same principles farther afield, to the Calvinist temples in France, or the Lutheran Churches in Germany, and still find—thanks to the sincerity of the worshippers—God-pleasing worship in the midst of schism and heresy.

Were we to take our stand in a Turkish mosque and behold the crowd of many good and religiously-minded men who prostrate themselves there, adoring God in all sincerity according to their lights, who amongst us would care to say or to think that God finds nothing but displeasure in their worship?

Yet it does not follow that a Christian could take part in the worship of the Moslem.

But observe.

We believe that such worship is good and pleasing to God *only* by reason of the sincerity or *bona fides* of the

worshippers. That it is so never diminishes by a hair's-breadth the fact that the religious system on which it is based is in itself schismatical and heretical, and even the High Church Anglican would not kneel with the Lutheran or the Calvinist, or be willing to give the faintest recognition to their dogmatic system as a part of the faith that is Catholic. Souls are one thing, systems are another. God, who loves a sincere soul, cannot love or approve what He knows to be a false or schismatical system.

Hence if we, as Catholics, are bound firmly to decline the vicar's invitation because Anglicanism in the eyes of the Catholic Church is schism and heresy, it does *not* follow that we make ourselves judges of our neighbour's conscience, or think harshly of his ways or of his worship.

Sincerity is the justification of worship, but any amount of sincerity cannot make a false religious system into a true one, or change a system which is schism or heresy into orthodoxy. Least of all, can it make valid a ministry or Sacraments which are invalid, or impart jurisdiction to those who are bereft of it.

A Catholic knows with the certainty of Divine faith where the True Church is to be found. Knowing it, he never with sincerity can take part in Anglican worship.

The same worship which in the mouth of these good people and the vicar is sincere praise, would in his be false and fictitious. The Communion Service from their lips would be, to them at least, the voice of Christian liturgy. But a Catholic would remember the history of its birth, and how in its present form it was framed and designed expressly as an instrument to admit and to convey the heresies of Cranmer. Issuing from the lips of a believing Catholic it would be, in view of its formal and historic character, a blasphemous travesty of the Sacrifice of the Mass.

Thus worship depends on the conscience of the worshipper, and what might be all that is sacred and pleasing to God when offered by the sincere Anglican, would be all that is hateful, heretical and hypocritical when offered by the Catholic.

All this appreciation of the position and duty of a Catholic which the pen has here travelled over so tediously and cumbrously, would, we take it, be intimated at once to the poorest village Romanist by the clear, rapid, penetrating intuitions of his Catholic heart and the silent voice of his Catholic conscience. His answer might be awkwardly worded, but the vicar would not have long to wait for it.

If unable to walk to the nearest Catholic Church, he would probably kneel in his room to recite "the prayers of Mass," uniting himself in spirit with his Catholic brethren throughout the world, and with the Adorable Victim Who he knows is being offered on the Catholic altar.

And if the chants of the parish church next door from time to time reached his ear, it would only be to prompt him to thank God the more heartily for his Faith, and to pray every blessing of soul and body on the worshippers, and above all to ask the Good Shepherd that they too might some day be led to know the beauty of Catholic truth and the joy of Catholic Communion.

CHAPTER XXXII.

Relics and Relic-Veneration.

(19TH SEPTEMBER, 1891.)

THE exposition of the Holy Coat at Trèves has elicited abundant comment and criticism from the non-Catholic press.

The event was one which challenged attention and claimed the notice of the Press. No journal, whether leading or local, could well refrain its lips consistently with its responsibility as interpreter of contemporary history to the general public.

As a result, much has been written, and in the multitude of words the sin of misrepresentation has not been wanting. The forms of misconception have been even more than usually manifold, and have varied with the standpoint and qualifications of the writer.

But there are two which are sufficiently common to all to appeal to the consideration of Catholics.

The first is, that the Popes "have guaranteed the authenticity" of relics, and that the guarantee thus given involves an exercise of Papal Infallibility.

The second is, that the presence of two or more relics of the same object in different places—"rival relics"—satisfactorily disproves the authenticity of one or all of them.

Both of these statements are unsound. If one could only overlook that initial defect, there can be no doubt that they would make excellent working premises.

For instance.

I invoke the second. It is quite clear that Our Lord's coat cannot be at Trèves and at Argenteuil at the same time.

Now I invoke the first. Leo X. issued a Bull to guarantee the authenticity of the relic at Trèves.

But Gregory XVI. in like manner confirmed the genuineness of the relic at Argenteuil.

Note the consequence.

Good Catholics are obliged to accept with deference the decisions of the Sovereign Pontiffs. They are bound to believe with Leo X. that the coat is at Trèves, while they are equally bound to believe with Gregory XVI. that it is at Argenteuil.

Moreover, Gregory XVI. is just as infallible as Leo X. It follows that the decision of the one Pontiff cannot be set aside in favour of the other.

Then we must believe in both, and do violence to our reason. Or, if we prefer it, we can believe in one and reject the other, in which case we set at naught at least one Papal utterance, and practically surrender our belief in Papal Infallibility.

Before we resign ourselves to be gored to death by such a dire dilemma, we may do well to test the strength of the horns. If they should prove to be of tissue-paper, neither ourselves nor the wearers will be really anything the worse for making the discovery.

To begin with, it is untrue that the Popes ever "guaranteed the authenticity" of any such relics as those at Trèves or Argenteuil.

The Church or her Pontiffs have received no revelation or inspiration from Heaven, not even any error-excluding *assistentia*, by which they are enabled to tell a true relic from a false one. For any assurance which they can give on such a matter, they are, of a necessity, depending upon the human wisdom and diligence of the Commission of "pious and learned" men to whom they have entrusted the work of investigation.

Let us take as a concrete instance the relic at Trèves. Its history for whole stretches of centuries is involved in comparative obscurity. It has passed through many vicissitudes. Its main voucher is the oral but constant tradition of a local church. The Bishop of Trèves and multitudes of the faithful hold to their tradition, and firmly believe in the genuineness of their relic. They naturally desire to give expression to their belief and devotion by a public act of solemn veneration. Before doing so they seek the sanction of the Roman Pontiff.

Let us see what such a sanction means. How is the Holy Father, or his counsellors at Rome, to judge of the authenticity of the relic at Trèves?

Were it merely a matter of testing the truth of some doctrinal tradition or practice, the Holy See would only have to measure it with its own divinely preserved standards *in luce urbis*, and to pronounce accordingly. Rome would have spoken, and the case would be decided.

But here it is a question of giving a judgment—not upon a doctrine nor upon a practice, nor even upon a dogmatic fact, but upon a given material object.

That is to say:—

There is a coat at Trèves. There was a coat worn by Our Lord on the day of His Crucifixion. The point is to identify the one coat with the other.

Can any one seriously expect the Holy See to undertake this work of identification?

How much would it mean?

One of two things.

(A) The Pope would have to trace the past history of the relic, and verify it at every stage along the whole line

of its passage from the hour when it left the hands of the lot-casters on Calvary until the day in 1196 when Archbishop John discovered it in the excavations of his church at Trèves.

That would imply a species of historic illumination, not only piercing the darkness of an unrecorded past, but lighting up the relic in its resting-place for centuries as it lay buried in the vaults of Trèves Cathedral!

The Holy See is fittingly the witness of all facts which fall under its purview, and which belong to the life and experience of the Church in all ages. But to identify a relic which for centuries has been hidden out of sight, and of which the Church herself possesses no written record before the twelfth century, is plainly matter which lies outside this purview of Apostolic testimony, and which seeks its solution in the ordinary court of historical investigation.

Or (B), the work of identification might be effected by careful examination of the relic itself, and by a judgment based, not only on historic, but on intrinsic evidence.

But such an inquiry would mean a Commission assembled upon the spot armed with the microscope, and proceeding upon the lines of an expert and scientific method.

The decision delivered by such a tribunal would be undoubtedly all that is respectable. But clearly it would stand upon its own merits. The Holy See could no more guarantee the accuracy of its conclusions than it could guarantee the verdict of the body of learned anthropologists who sat in judgment upon the famous jaw-bone of Moulin-Quignon, or the skull of the very old man at Cro-Magnon.

Then how is the Holy See to act, and what answer should it give to Trèves that petitions for its solemnity?

Three courses of action lie open.

The first would be to forbid it peremptorily.

Such a prohibition, without inquiry into the merits of the case, would be all that is arbitrary and tyrannical. To the multitudes who conscientiously believe—and have the undoubted right to believe—in the tradition and the genuineness of the relic, it would be a gross act of spiritual oppression.

The second would be to permit it at once unreservedly.

To do so without due examination of the claims would be plainly a want of Apostolic vigilance and prudence, which would expose the faithful at large, if not to dangers of imposition, at least to the risk of being misled by the enthusiasm of local devotion.

The third course—the obvious one—would be to appoint a Commission of “pious and learned men” to examine the claim of the relic, and if they can discover no positive evidence of imposture, and find that there is reasonable presumption for believing that the relic is what it is claimed to be, to accept the report, and, on the strength of it, grant the required permission for exposition and veneration.

This final course represents the actual proceeding of the Holy See in this and all like cases. And it would be hard to conceive a more reasonable way of safeguarding on the one side Catholic liberty of devotion, and, on the other, securing that quality of “reasonable service” which must ever be the chief glory of Catholic worship.

The Holy See very naturally, and very reasonably, requires the favourable report of a Commission as a condition to its sanction of public veneration. Nothing could be more unfair than to take advantage of that fact to saddle the Holy See with the responsibility of the inerrancy of the report, and construe its action as “guaranteeing the authenticity” of the relic.

The assurance as to authenticity rests and remains upon the authority of the Commission of investigation. The value of its judgment equals precisely the skill, research or discernment which has been brought to its formation.

Certainty, like water, never rises higher than its source. When the Holy See accepts the decision of a Commission as a basis of sanction, it does not add to the intrinsic value of the evidence, nor lift it into a higher plane of credibility.

The Holy See cannot guarantee the actual accuracy of the local finding any more than it could guarantee the truth of the verdict found by any local jury. Nor can the infallibility of the Church or of her Pontiff be put into commission or pinned to the decision of a local inquiry. Hence the

direct question of authenticity or non-authenticity of a relic such as that of Trèves or Argenteuil is not one to which the magisterium or teaching authority, and least of all the infallibility of the Church or Pontiffs, can in any way be committed. The very most that we can say of it is that a local Commission charged to investigate the claim of such relics recorded its belief in their authenticity, and that the Holy See regarded the fact that such a decision was given as sufficient reason to permit that those who believed in the relics should have an opportunity of venerating them publicly.

By way of stating the action of the Church more clearly, it may be allowed to conceive the Holy See as practically addressing the Church of Trèves in the following terms:—

“ You claim to have in your possession Our Lord’s seamless coat. You desire to venerate it publicly. We cannot of ourselves judge whether your claim be well founded. But we have required a Commission of learned and pious men to be appointed to examine it. They have reported in your favour. We do not authoritatively teach that your relic is authentic. On the contrary, we leave every Catholic free to believe or not to believe in it, for the authenticity of relics does not fall under any precept of Catholic faith. But we accept the report of the Commission as sufficient grounds for allowing you and all who believe in it to exercise their right of having it exposed and venerated in public. Moreover, as the veneration thus given is of its nature relative, and is finally directed as an act of love and homage to Christ Himself, it remains a good and meritorious work independently of any certainty as to authenticity. Wherefore we reward with indulgences those who sincerely and devoutly take part in it.”

Far from us be the peril and presumption of putting words into the mouth of the Church. But it may be permitted even to the least of us to state thus, by way of illustration, what we conceive to be the accepted interpretation of her attitude and action.

The second horn of the dilemma is also of the collapsible kind.

It is urged by *The Church Times*, on the authority of two German professors, that there are "forty" seamless coats of Our Lord venerated in different parts of Christendom and that only one can be genuine.

The restriction is not at all conclusive.

There is, of course, but one seamless coat for which the executioners of Our Lord cast lots during the Crucifixion.

But there is, after all, no absolute proof that during the thirty-three years of His mortal life Our Lord never wore any other but one and the same coat.

Nor is it clear that the "forty" reckoned up by hostile authorities may not include what are in reality relics of other parts of Our Lord's vesture, such as part of His white mantle much venerated at Moscow, or the fragments of His robe preserved at Cortona, or those of His purple mantle kept at Venice and Rome.

Such relics of vesture are in a sense both multiple and divisible—multiple in so much as Our Lord's vesture consisted of more than one garment, and divisible in so much as each garment might be divided (as the coat at Argenteuil was in fact divided at the Revolution) into any number of parts, and be distributed throughout Christendom for the veneration of the faithful. These are not reasons for believing in a multiplicity of seamless coats, but they are reasons for not insisting too strongly on the necessary uniqueness of relics which pass under that name. It is fairly certain that St. John the Baptist had only one skull, and the fact that various relics of the said skull are venerated in various parts of Christendom (each called simply "the skull of the Baptist") proves not that he had many skulls, nor that any or all such relics are "rival" and spurious, but simply that men discovered that St. John's skull, like most other skulls, was divisible into parts.

It is a matter of some surprise that journals which write from the higher altitudes of Anglicanism should have joined with *The Rock* and *The Record* not merely in vehemently impugning the authenticity of the relic at Trèves, but in attacking the whole principle of the public veneration of relics.

Such a standpoint hardly fits in with the plea for continuity with antiquity and the early English Church. The English Church was hardly born when Rome put relics in its hands.

St. Bede, describing the foundation of the first "Italian Mission," says:—

"The said Pope Gregory sent to Augustine all things which were needful for the worship and service of the Church, namely, sacred vessels, altar linen, church ornaments, priestly and clerical vestments, *relics of the holy Apostles and Martyrs*, and also many books" (*Hist. Ecc.*, l. i., c. 29).

The Penitential attributed to Theodore, whom Pope Vitalian sent as Primate here in 668, says:—

"The relics of the Saints are to be venerated, and if it is possible, in churches where relics are preserved, let a light be kept burning every night" (c. 48).

St. Bede lay on his death-bed on Ascension Eve in 735. Cuthbert, the monk who describes his death, tells us that at nine o'clock that day was held the usual public procession of the relics (*Epist. Cuthberti Hist. Ecc. Bædæ*, ed. Smith, 792).

The Pontifical of Egbert, Archbishop of York, in Anglo-Saxon times says:—

"Thence, on the day preceding the consecration of a church, relics are to be provided by the Bishop and laid in such a place that they may remain amid hymns, and praises, and lights, until they are taken thence and carried to the spot where they are to be deposited" (Fol. xxxviii. b).

The Council of Chalcuith, A.D. 816, commands "relics, or in defect of them, the Blessed Eucharist," to be used in the consecration of churches (*Wilkins' Concilia*, i., 169).

As to the approbation of relics, the voice of the English Church rings clearly forth in the Constitutions or Synod of Bishop Peter Quivil of Exeter in 1287:—

"Since Holy (Writ) teaches that wonders are wrought by the wicked as well as by the good, therefore in cases of doubt recourse must be had to the Most Holy Roman Church, which, by the grace of God Almighty, in the au-

thority of the Apostolical tradition is proved to have never fallen into error, and her decision is to be awaited, lest any one, by approving what she disapproves, should be accounted by Catholics as a heretic.

“ Wherefore, we know that in the General Council it was wisely prohibited that any one for the future should presume publicly to venerate recently found relics unless they were first of all approved by the Roman Pontiff.

“ We command the above prohibition to be carefully observed by all, and decree that no person shall expose relics for sale, and that neither stones, nor fountains, trees, wood, or garments shall in any way be venerated on account of dreams or on fictitious grounds, seeing that the Apostolic teaching declares that such conduct savours of heretical depravity. And to no man is it allowable to teach or to hold otherwise than the Roman Church, the Mother of all Churches, will have seen good to hold and to teach. If any shall presume to contravene this decree, unless they shall renounce their error, being admonished of the same, we adjudge them to be severely punished as heretics ” (Wilkins’ *Concilia*, ii., 155).

Had Bishop Quivil been alive to-day, he would probably have read the brief of Leo XIII. to his people, and have been by this time on his way in pilgrimage to Trèves. As to the Anglican critics who denounce a solemnity which “ the Most Holy Roman Church ” approves, he would, to use his own vigorous thirteenth-century phrase, have “ adjudged them to be severely punished as heretics ”.

CHAPTER XXXIII.

Anglican Appropriation—Why not appropriate the Pope ?

(26TH SEPTEMBER, 1891.)

CATHOLICS must always remember that when they hear their Anglican friends deprecating all that is “ foreign ” or “ Italian ” in matters of religion, that such protests must be taken with some measure of good-natured discount.

Anglicanism in our regard spells Appropriation.

Half a century ago it began by appropriating our doctrines. Then it appropriated our vestments and altar furniture. Next it appropriated our clerical clothing—our birettas, our cassocks, and, least excusably of all, our collars—the collar of Pius VI.—on which, both by shape and origin, the character of Roman was written so plainly.

Then it appropriated our ceremonies from the *Missa Cantata* to the "Stations of the Cross". (A pile of our Church music went with the vestments.) It has grasped large handfuls of our institutions, and taken almost more than it could carry away—from the rules of our brotherhoods, sisterhoods and confraternities.

It has taken over, not only our clerical costumes but our clerical customs—in last week's *Guardian* was advertised a list of nineteen "retreats for the clergy".

Then it captured our Saints, and such ecclesiastical *Italianissimi* (in the good sense of the word) as St. Thomas Aquinas, St. Bonaventure, St. Charles Borromeo are, as we have seen, actually standing at this moment with angelic patience in the niches of an Anglican reredos.

Anglicanism has contrived to do all this and more, while it has beguiled our attention by expressing with needless energy its rooted repugnance to all such elements of religion as are "foreign," "continental," "Italian," or "Papal". The lady protests too much.

If Anglicanism pursues this path of appropriation—and it is hard to see how it can either turn aside or turn back—a point must be reached when nothing will be left with us but the Pope.

Then what will remain but to take him also?

When that day has arrived, advanced Anglicanism will have found its logical term, and we shall have recovered our own with interest.

But Anglicanism with the Pope would be no longer Anglicanism. As a system it feels neither the wish nor the need of a Pope. It is so constructed as to exclude one. It is built upon the theory that national churches are independent, and that bishops are autonomous.

Naturally, a bishop cannot, any more than a clergyman, be allowed to teach and act as he pleases, or to sacrifice the faith to his personal views or caprices. For, although there is no head between the bishop on earth and the Divine Head in heaven, there is amply wherewith to control the bishop and keep him in order. There are the Canons and the Creeds, and there are the Metropolitans, with the Provincial Synods to expound and enforce them. Parts of the Church are naturally held in check by the Church as a whole, and by the very fact of their solidarity.

The Bishop in the diocese—the Episcopate in a nation—the Church in the world. These form a triple line of defence to preserve the faith once delivered to the Saints, pure and entire within the fold, and to keep false teachers and ravening wolves out of doors.

Then why have recourse to anything so onerous and so odious as a Central Supremacy when orthodoxy and Church order can be so easily and abundantly safeguarded without it?

Except a needless subjection, nothing is so much to be deprecated as a needless centralisation. Hence Anglicanism cries “no Pope,” because it feels convinced that the Divine plan of the Church is complete and works quite naturally and normally without him.

How far does Anglican theory fit in with Anglican experience?

In one respect, the design for the seal of the new Church House, taken from an Italian Friar—Fra Angelico—is happily significant. The scene of Christ sending forth His Apostles to teach is not only a magnificent expression of the doctrine of “Apostolic Succession,” but one which lays eloquent emphasis upon that most vital corollary of it which is so apt to be evaded or travestied in these days by the Broad Churchman and the Dissenter—the Divine institution of the Episcopacy.

That is excellent ground to defend, and we would gladly interpret the design upon the seal as a declaration that the Church House and the Pan-Anglicanism of which it is to be the centre and the rallying-ground are resolved once and for all to take their stand upon it.

To every sincere and conscientious Anglican we conceive that a denial of Episcopacy as a Divine institution can be nothing short of heresy and a betrayal of the faith. If it were otherwise, we should have to resign ourselves, not without regret, to the conviction that the difference between Anglicanism and the lowest forms of Evangelicalism—or even of Lutheranism, Presbyterianism and Dissent—are not worth the reckoning.

From such a standpoint we can readily understand the grief and indignation with which Anglicans, both upon this and on the other side of the Atlantic, have witnessed the result of the recent Episcopal election in Boston.

Dr. Phillips Brooks was an eminent and leading city clergyman. The fact that he had openly denied the Divine institution of Episcopacy, and that he cordially acknowledged the Church status of non-Episcopal bodies, was probably as well and as widely known as the fame of his preaching or the fact of his existence. We speak not of his giving Communion to Unitarians on Good Friday.

Here we stand at the first line of defence in the Anglican theory.

If the Anglican system were true to its specification, Dr. Brooks ought long since to have been suspended from the ministry as a teacher of heresy.

He was not.

His bishop, as far as we know, did not offer so much as a word of remonstrance. And when the bishop died, Dr. Brooks himself was elected in his stead by an overwhelming majority. And now that he himself is dead, he is honoured with a special window and laudatory epitaph in Westminster Abbey.

Apparently the first line of defence—the Diocesan—cannot be relied upon as a guarantee of “Catholicity” even so far as to safeguard the *jure divino* institution of episcopacy.

But then the Metropolitan, or the Provincial Synod ought to have intervened, or, failing such agencies, the required remedy was clearly to be expected from the whole Anglican Episcopate in America.

For, if the defence of the Divine institution of Episcopacy is not to be taken up by the Bishops themselves, to whom can Anglicans look to defend it?

Here, then, before the face of the whole religious world, the Anglican theory of Church government was put upon its trial. A Pope it could not, and would not have. Its very citadel—the sheet-anchor of its hope—for the maintenance of orthodoxy and the exclusion of heresy, is the corrective judgment, authority and action of a National Episcopate.

Thus we are standing now at the second line of defence.

Anxiously the eyes and hearts of sincere Anglicans were turned westward to see how it would stand the strain.

It failed them.

Dr. Brooks was a powerful and popular preacher. He had the consensus of the clergy and laity of the diocese behind him.

The Bishops either cared not, or dared not, refuse their sanction. (What are we to think of their orthodoxy if they cared not?—or of their courage if they dared not?)

Cranmer never bowed to King Henry with more complaisance than the American prelates bowed to King Majority.

They approved the election, and have expressed their readiness to consecrate the candidate—even though he be the denier of the Divine origin of the very Episcopal order which they propose to confer upon him.

So surrendered in the hour of need the “National Episcopate”—the inner bulwark of Anglican orthodoxy.

Events have no lesson to teach if the Boston Bishopric does not prove that “National Episcopates” are practical failures as a working guarantee for the preservation of faith, or the exclusion of heresy.

One would hardly care to describe the hopelessness and helplessness of such a collapse in any stronger terms than those which certain American Anglicans themselves have been prompt to apply to it.

Speaking of the action of the Bishops who consented to Dr. Brooks' election, a High Church organ, *The Catholic Champion*, says:—

But the bitter grief, the shame and contempt of Churchmen, must go out against the human personality of those Bishops who, being more or less strong and intelligent Churchmen themselves, have bowed down before an idle, temporary clamour. If the real war with Antichrist shall come in their day, how will they stand? They have been carried into places of great honour by the Catholic life of the Church. They turn about and cast down the precious pearl before the first rush of trampling swine.

One point of vantage yet remains.

When a "National Episcopate" fails, may not the Anglican system hold in reserve something yet higher and better to fall back upon?

A General Council of reunited Christendom?

That would be Quixotic. Such a reunion of Christendom, for aught we know, may not take place for centuries. The Bishopric at Boston can hardly be kept vacant in the meantime. What is wanted is a practical remedy for keeping the Church upon the track, and securing the prompt expulsion of wolves from the fold—not ages hence!—but just now amid the wants and needs of the nineteenth century. Such a remedy must be actual—not conditional or prospective.

Then, as a final resource, the Anglican Church may be considered as a whole—as Pan-Anglicanism—rising above and beyond the feebleness and faultiness of mere National Episcopates. It may be taken, for instance, as forming a quasi-Patriarchate centring in the See of Canterbury.

Is there a remedy and refuge here?

Will Pan-Anglicanism correct American Anglicanism? Or will the Archbishop of Canterbury correct Dr. Brooks?

Not even the most sanguine Anglican would have the courage to hope for it.

Will the next Pan-Anglican meeting at Lambeth arraign Dr. Brooks or revise his election?

It cannot.

The Pan-Anglican Assembly is a *Conference*. It is not a *Council* or a *Court*. It passes resolutions. It does not even attempt, like the Œcumenical Council, to pass Canons or pronounce an authoritative or judicial sentence.

Its Bishops would deprecate the very idea of sitting in

judgment upon any prelate so powerful and influential as the Bishop-elect in Boston.

Like their brethren in America, they would not if they dared, and they dared not if they would.

There is no help there.

Could not the Archbishop of Canterbury, as "Patriarch of the Anglican Communion," come to the rescue? Is it nothing to him that heresy is taught, and false teachers consecrated within the Anglican fold?

He cannot.

Anglicanism has tied his hands. The theory of a "Primacy of honour," or of a Church ruler who is *primus inter pares*, may be pleasing and plausible enough when we are in a sufficiently selfish mood to think of nothing better than our own personal or national "Independence".

But it is worse than a bruised and broken reed as a means of holding a Church, in any real crisis, within the lines of order or orthodoxy.

Such a work means effective control, and that in turn means no mere honorary presidency, but solid and authoritative jurisdiction.

To realise the force of the first, we have only to conceive Dr. Benson issuing an admonition and an injunction to veto Dr. Brooks' appointment! The consecration of Dr. Hampden and the institution of Mr. Gorham remind us that the Archbishop of Canterbury cannot do such things at home, much less across the Atlantic.

So fails, as far as we can discover, the last and final resource provided by the Anglican system for the defence of its "Catholicity".

Thus the verdict of events is to us the practical proof that the Anglican theory of the sufficiency of National Episcopates and of "doing without a Pope" is one which sooner or later breaks down in the working.

The theory fails, and just at the very moment and at the very juncture when its help was most needed.

If such proofs, written in the life of nations and strong

with the irresistible strength of facts, are to us conclusive and decisive, we must remember that it is Anglicanism itself which furnishes them and holds them up before our eyes for our instruction and conviction.

Nor, indeed, is there any necessity to cross the Atlantic to witness the completeness of its failure.

How many pious Anglicans firmly believe in the Sacrifice of the Mass, in the Real Presence, and reverently kneel to adore the Eucharist. To them, such doctrines are surely not less sacred and dear as an integral part of the "Catholic Faith" than the belief in Apostolical Succession, of which they are the theological superstructure.

And yet they have to live under Anglican Bishops in England (in Liverpool and Worcester) who deny these truths as vehemently as ever Dr. Brooks denied the Divine origin of Episcopacy, just as Lord Halifax has to receive communion kneeling at the side of Mr. Kensit.

Both cannot be right.

If the Anglican worshipper of the Host is orthodox, these Anglican Bishops are heretical. If these Anglican Bishops are orthodox, the Anglican worshipper is heretical and idolatrous. In one or the other case, faith is *not* preserved or heresy is *not* excluded.

The late Dr. Elliot, of Bristol, proved to demonstration that it is possible to be a member—a clergyman—a dignitary of the Church of England and to live and act as such to the age of ninety without even believing in baptismal regeneration.

Thus the saddest element in the theory of Anglicanism seems to us to be that it imposes upon its adherents by pure force of its own circumstances, and despite its better instincts, a degraded and ignoble—to us, an impossible—ideal of the Catholic Church.

In its mind the Church is one which panders to and tolerates heresy in her fold—which teaches truth and heresy in the same breath, and often from the same pulpits—which even appoints heretical clergymen and consecrates heretical Bishops—which dares not to authoritatively define her own

doctrine—which dares not to enforce a definition if made—which dares not depose an heretical teacher.

It would be difficult to conceive anything more diametrically opposed to the ideal of the New Testament, the “Pillar and the Ground of Truth,” or to the ideal of antiquity, the Catholic Church of the first four General Councils, so full of minutely defining precision and vigorously deposing energy.

And reading the lesson which is thus graven in the events of our time, we have it borne in upon us that the Primacy of the Apostolic See is above all things what the higher Anglicanism needs most, and that nothing but the appropriation of the Pope will give logical completeness to its policy and happy fulfilment to its best aspirations.

CHAPTER XXXIV.

An Anglican Church Congress—Who is the Alien ?

(17TH OCTOBER, 1891.)

AN Annual Congress is to a Church very much what the autumn manœuvres are to the Army—a public demonstration of its vitality and efficiency.

In the year 1891 Anglicanism mobilised its effective strength and has made a demonstration in force in Wales.

Anglicanism went to Wales with two arguments in its hands.

In its right, it carried the Statistical Argument, in which it said: “For a long time past my activity has been unbounded, and my progress has been enormous. And I am daily strengthening my hold upon the conscience and affections of the Welsh people.”

This important part of the brief was energetically handled by Dr. Edwards, the Anglican Bishop of St. Asaph’s.

In its left, it carried the Historical Argument, in which it said to the Welsh people: “I am not an alien or an intruder amongst you; I am the Ancient Church of the country”.

This contention found its exponent in the Archbishop of Canterbury.

How far the statistical plea is well founded, or how far Dr. Edwards' figures are printed in facts, is not our concern. If the Bishop had been able to multiply his totals by ten, it could hardly be for us a matter of regret. Wales is not a Catholic country, and taking the Welsh Nonconformist as he stands, it is difficult to see that he would be anything the worse for the education which the Anglican would be anxious to give him. Anglicanism cannot give to the people of England or of Wales what it does not possess—Catholic faith or a Catholic ministry. But, as a part of the dramatic justice of its own career, it can devote its labour, even unwittingly and unwillingly, to make both peoples Catechumens for Catholicity.

The historical plea is more interesting, and approaches us much more nearly.

The visit of the Archbishop of Canterbury to Wales, in order to make an appeal to the Welsh, is an event which is highly suggestive. People who have an ear for historic harmonies, turn naturally and look down the long vista of the past in search of historical precedents.

At the distance of some six hundred years, there is one which stands out in luminous relief.

The Archbishop of Canterbury whose name and work are most associated with the Church in Wales is certainly John Peckham, who sat in the chair of St. Augustine from 1279 to 1292.

We have Dr. Benson in 1891. And six centuries farther down the scale of the ages, we have John Peckham still living in 1291.

Let us strike the two notes and judge of the harmony.

John Peckham was a Franciscan Friar.

He was born about the time that St. Francis died. A thirteenth-century Franciscan was very much what a modern Anglican means when he uses the word "Ultramontane". The rule of St. Francis contained a special profession of obedience to the Pope, and went farther, and used very strong terms when it required that all its members "should be always subject to, and under the feet of the Roman

Church" (Rule of St. Francis in *Monumenta Franciscana*, vol. ii.).

A man who makes it the rule of his life to be "always under the feet of the Roman Church," if measured by his own professions, may be clearly set down as a Roman Catholic, and an Ultramontane of Ultramontanes.

When Archbishop Kilwardby, by permission of Pope Nicholas III., resigned the See of Canterbury in 1278, King Edward I. was most anxious that his Chancellor, Robert Burnel, Bishop of Bath and Wells, should succeed to the Primacy. He had no trouble in having him elected by the Chapter. On 10th July, 1278, the King gave his Royal Assent to the election, and on the same day wrote specially to the Pope to solicit his confirmation.

The Pope did not see fit to accede to the King's petition. He annulled the election, and set aside the candidate. Then, of his own choice, the Holy Father appointed Friar John Peckham, who was then a celebrated lecturer and auditor at Rome, and consecrated him with his own hands.

Thus it was the strong arm of the Pope who placed Friar John on the Primatial throne of Canterbury.

Friar John made a virtuous, vigorous and exemplary Archbishop.

When Edward I. invaded Wales and crushed the resistance of Llewellyn and the Welsh Princes, Archbishop Peckham courageously made a visitation through Wales, and everywhere acted as mediator between the victor and the vanquished.

In this work of merciful mediation, he had occasion to draw up certain points which he desired Llewellyn to impress upon the consideration of the Welsh chieftains. By way of reducing them to a sense of due submission, he wanted them to know, that if all other means failed him, he would not fail to denounce their conduct to the Holy See:—

"If they will ignore our efforts and entreaties, we purpose to forthwith report their obstinacy to the Sovereign Pontiff and to the Roman Court, on account of the multiplied mortal

sins which are daily occasioned by this discord" (*Registrum Joannis Peckham*, vol. ii., 436).

By way of anticipating the reply that the road to Rome was open to more than one person, the Archbishop adds:—

"Let them bear in mind that the Kingdom of England is under the special protection of the Apostolic See. And the Roman Court is wont to love it more dearly than any other Kingdom. Further, that the said Court will not by any means suffer any danger to threaten the safety of the Kingdom of England, which is devoted to it by more than usual services."

Llewellyn's answer was couched in pacific terms, but he trusted "that there would be no need of reporting the obstinacy of the Welsh to the Lord Pope".

He adds:—

"And although the Kingdom of England is specially subject to, and specially beloved by the Roman Court, still as the Lord Pope and the Roman Court will have heard of the wrongs done to us by the English—treaties broken, our churches burnt and destroyed, clergy, priests, monks and nuns and other religious slaughtered, women and children, and babes at the breast slain and spitted, hospitals and monasteries burnt down, bloodshed in the graveyards and churches, and even on the altars, sacrileges and crimes which would horrify even the ears of pagans, and as all these things are written down and set forth in detail in our records, we have forwarded them to you for your inspection" (*The Letters of Llewellyn*).

That Llewellyn and the Welsh Princes, not less cordially than the English, acknowledged the authority of the Pope, is attested by the appeal of Llewellyn to Gregory X. and the letters of Gerald de Barry (*Haddan and Stubbs' Councils*, vol. i., 399, 506).

During a considerable portion of his Episcopate, Archbishop Peckham was troubled with an unruly cleric called Tedisius de Camillo. The case went to Rome. The Archbishop in appealing to the Sovereign Pontiff says:—

“We appeal in these writings to the Most Holy and Apostolic See. . . . We place ourselves, our Church, our household, and all who in this matter are concerned with us, under the protection and shelter of the said Apostolic See” (*Register*, ii., 420).

A little later on, when he had reason to fear that the same case might be decided against him, he wrote to the Roman Court in the following terms:—

“We shall be ready at all times to lay our neck under the decisions of the Sacred Apostolic See, however much the littleness of our own judgment or the zeal of our affection might inwardly seem to resent it” (*ibid.*, 512).

When he received good news of his case, he thanks the Sovereign Pontiff “on the knees of his heart”.

Throughout the three volumes of his letters, his language and attitude to the Holy See are consistently that of unswerving devotion.

His letters to the Pope have nearly always the same beginning:—

“To the Most Holy Father and Lord, by the grace of God, Sovereign Pontiff of the Most Holy Roman and Universal Church, John, the least of his brethren, by permission of the same, Archbishop of Canterbury, kissing the blessed feet with all manner of reverence.”

His references to the Holy See are ever in terms of enthusiastic loyalty:—

“The eminence of your see, Most Holy Father, which governs all powers throughout the whole Church, is seen to send forth its splendour above all principalities and thrones.”

And his letters have nearly all the same ending:—

“Long may your sacred authority, Most Holy Father, shine forth in the Church of God” (*ibid.*, 325).

Then putting side by side Dr. Benson and Friar John Peckham, where shall we find the harmony?

Is it in the observance of the rule of St. Francis?

Is it the manner of appointment?

Is it in the form or source of their consecration?

Is it in the religious beliefs—the Thirty-nine Articles subscribed by the one, and the Decrees of the Councils of Lateran and Lyons professed by the other?

Is it in their attitude towards the Apostolic See?

But subtract rule of life, appointment, consecration, religious belief and teaching, allegiance from two Bishops, and what remains wherein to compare them?

The Archbishop of Canterbury, in his address to the Church Congress at Rhyl, went behind the Reformation for arguments to prove to the Welsh people that the Establishment is not an alien Church in Wales:—

But of all charges, the broadest, the most sweeping, the most taking, so to speak, is the most untrue: the Church in Wales, we are told, is "an alien Church". An alien Church! That has at once so glib and so ringing a sound. But has it any meaning? When was it found out that it was an alien Church? Did the old Eisteddfods think it was when harpers and bards were scholars and teachers in the Church, even down to the days of Bishop Heber? Was it thought an alien Church when Archbishop Peckham made his toilsome journey the whole land through, because the Church alone, which belonged alike to both, could explain English policy to Llewellyn and conciliate the goodwill of King Edward?

Was it alien?

Not at all. The alienism is not between Archbishop Peckham and the Welsh Church, but between the Church of Dr. Benson and that of Archbishop Peckham.

In the olden time both Englishmen and Welshmen, however bitter their feuds, were brothers in holy faith and obedience. Both were children of the same great Catholic mother. Both looked with love and loyalty to the Apostolic See of Rome. In religion, at least, neither could be alien to the other.

The alienism dates from the Reformation.

We pray that both England and Wales may once more find their brotherhood in the house of faith, where alone it can be found. When they take each other's hands as children of the same Catholic Church, they will turn, as they turned of old, with loving allegiance to the Chief See in Christendom.

CHAPTER XXXV.

A Sample of Low Church Opinion.

(24TH OCTOBER, 1891.)

THE week before last, all that was highest and best in Anglicanism was represented at Rhyl.

But Anglicanism has within it certain forces which in tone, in temper, in earnestness of speech and depth of conviction are not of a kind which could easily make itself at home or speak its mind fully and freely upon a platform so cultured and coldly comprehensive as that of a Church Congress.

These forces are plainly, frankly, straightforwardly Protestant.

Last week they held meetings at Brighton, Clifton and Manchester. In so far as they present to us, at least, one side of Anglicanism—albeit not the most elevated or the most lovable—a few of their utterances may not be without interest and instruction.

The English Churchman opens an interesting account of the Congress at Brighton by noting that it stands out in marked contrast to the Church Congress at Rhyl.

Whether the contrast is refreshing or otherwise may be a matter of taste, and whether it can be fairly grounded on the Papal predilections of the latter, may be a matter of judgment. But of the fact of contrast there is no doubt whatever. Any scepticism on the point would be dispelled by a moment's comparison of the Rhyl speeches with those delivered at Brighton.

The English Churchman says:—

The change from Rhyl Church Congress to the National Protestant Congress at Brighton is, indeed, a refreshing contrast. At the former, Popery, more or less advanced, was unblushingly advocated, while at the latter those doctrines only have been taught which are founded on the Written Word of God.

Immediately after the offering of a prayer and the singing of a hymn, the Chairman (Sir A. Blackwood) made the

opening address. Before denouncing the Catholic Church (which contains more than 200,000,000 of his fellow-Christians) as "Babylon," "the Mother of Abominations," and "directly diabolical in its origin," he deprecated anything like bitterness.

Lest it should occur to some fastidious critic to think that such expressions and the views which suggest them are, after all, fairly bitter to begin with, Sir A. Blackwood anticipates the objection by making a distinction. He holds that to use such language is speaking strongly, but not speaking bitterly. That is why it is a great mistake to regard those who use this form of strong language as "firebrands," or "strife-makers," and why those who are capable of such a confusion of thought are quite unworthy of an answer.

We take it that Sir Arthur Blackwood's contention is simply that his war is with our system and not with ourselves. That is perfectly legitimate ground—*diligite viros, interficite errores!*—and when we hear the Church that we love dearly as a mother called by unmentionable names, we must, in the spirit of fairness and charity, try to remember the distinction.

The speech, as described by an admiring correspondent of *The English Churchman*, contains the following passage:—

He commenced by deprecating anything like bitterness. They might speak strongly without bitterness. He had no doubt that they would be considered by many as nothing better than firebrands, and even as monomaniacs, and as stirrers up of strife in the land. But they were not careful to answer those who so thought. With them the question was: What is considered as important by their Divine Master? And what they wished to ascertain was, how God regards the adversaries of His truth. Of all the forms of error contrary to God's Word described and denounced in the Bible, none is described and denounced with more minuteness than that form of error which they had met that evening in combat. It is described fully in the Old Testament, and in the New Testament it is referred to as the "mystery of iniquity," the great Apostasy, and as Babylon the Great, the Mother of Harlots and abominations of the earth, drunken with the blood of the saints, and with the blood of the martyrs of Jesus. It is further described as directly diabolical in its origin, "after the working of Satan," with all signs and "lying wonders". In short, Romanism is a counterfeit Christianity, and Satan's masterpiece.

If the speaker and his audience really believe that we are all that we are in these terms described to be—and of their honesty and sincerity we can have no reason to doubt—they are, of course, abundantly right in opposing us. The peril of passing such a terrible judgment upon their fellow-men, and a body which, after all, is the bulk of Christendom, is a consideration which no doubt has been prayerfully and conscientiously weighed before making it. With such religiously-minded men, such a judgment can only have been arrived at with sorrow, and must have cost an effort and a pang to the charity of the Christian hearts that made it. The fact that it has been made despite such difficulties is only further proof of the exceptional moral courage which advances where minds of the average mould would have seen reason to reflect and to hesitate.

But we are not the only culprits.

Speakers and writers at such ultra-Protestant meetings have fallen into an unpleasant habit of bracketing us with Anglicans under the term "Romanism and Ritualism". No doubt the practice is highly distasteful to Anglicans, and we can answer for it that it is certainly not less so to ourselves. Sometimes "Rationalism" is thrown in as a third partner, and thus a newer and better numeration of the "three R's" is felicitously called into existence. To that there can be no objection whatever, and it would be a pity to spoil the alliteration, but unhappily, Rationalism hardly ever gets its proper share, and when we come to examine the speeches made and the papers read, we invariably find that it is ourselves and the "Ritualists" who are the subjects of nine-tenths of the indictment.

What have we done to deserve it?

To understand that aright we must bear in mind, first, that we are considered as aggressors. Secondly, that our aggression is of a particularly provoking and insidious kind. Thirdly, that this aggression consists in attacking Protestantism by making use of Ritualists as an advanced guard thrown forward to capture the pulpits and places of trust in the Church of England.

When an honest Protestant has learned to see in every

“Ritualist” a Romanist Uhlan in disguise stealing a march upon the citadel that he loves, little wonder that his wrath is terrible against Ritualism and tenfold terrible against the Roman enemy behind it.

Let a Catholic only imagine to himself what he would feel and say and do if it were our case that Protestantism were daily advancing upon us, and that we found men of Protestant sympathies and pronounced Protestantising tendencies working their way into our priesthood and freely propagating their heretical views and practices in the pulpit and in the schoolroom and in the confessional. Such a contingency is happily inconceivable, but the mere thought of it should inspire us with infinite indulgence to those who in the exigency of such a cruel position use expressions that are somewhat stronger than they need be.

That such an epikeia fully applies to the utterances of the Chairman is clear from the concluding portions of his address as given in *The Record*:—

The errors against which they were contending had obtained an entrance into their own walls, and were undermining them. Subterranean galleries were filled with enemies, and they stood in a position of peculiar, he had almost said of appalling, danger for the truth of God in this land.

And :—

It had been said that except Papal Supremacy and the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin Mary, there was not a single error proclaimed by the Council of Trent which was not now preached from a multitude of pulpits in the Church of England. There was, therefore, it was asserted, no need for their becoming Roman Catholics; all the errors of Rome were committed within the walls of the National Protestant and Established Church, and were spreading with a rapidity which was terrible to contemplate. It was, therefore, time that they rose up against those errors, to exert their influence for their suppression.

The address was followed by a remarkable paper by the Rev. Dr. Grattan Guinness, which is thus described by *The English Churchman*:—

Romanism has its seat in the corrupt heart of man. “We are all Romanists at heart,” he exclaimed, “call us what you may,” and nothing can set us free but the renovation of the Holy Spirit.

Romanism is superhuman—that is, Satanical—and this explains its power. In resisting Popery we are resisting wickedness in high places. Dr. Guinness devoted a considerable portion of his paper to an explanation of the motives which induced the late Cardinal Newman to join the Roman Church, quoting largely from his *Apologia*, and concluded by declaring that Romanism is a “cross between the human and Satanical”.

It was at this point of the proceedings that the assembly decided to send a telegram of fraternal greeting to the Protestant Union which was at that moment protesting in Manchester:—

“The National Protestant Congress, now sitting in Brighton, sends fraternal greetings to the Evangelical Protestant Union in Manchester, praying that God may use their united efforts in helping to awaken the national conscience on the subject of Protestantism.”

How Manchester was already doing its part with Lancashire thoroughness, and saying to-day—just for once—what England will *not* say to-morrow, will be seen later on.

Lord Lichfield sounded the same note of alarm:—

He assured them that a great deal of work was needed, for the danger now before them was far greater than they had hitherto contemplated. In looking back to the history of this country, he saw nothing like it excepting what occurred 200 years ago. The movement which was then made to lead the Church of England back to Rome was much the same; though, to his mind, it had infinitely less danger than the movement which was now being made to Romanise the Church of England.

Another gentleman—the Rev. J. Kerr—found it sufficiently consistent with charity and justice to propose that several millions of his fellow-subjects should be at once deprived of their civic rights. He did so, not amid the disapproval, but amid the applause of his audience:—

He referred to the Guild of Ransomers as a mob-law Association, and declared, amid the hearty cheers of the meeting, that they must demand the repeal of the Catholic Emancipation Act of 1829.

Another speaker summed up his appreciation of the “Romish Creed” by simply saying that it was “audacious, idolatrous and tyrannical”.

There are certainly some persons to whom such language and such proceedings would have at least suggested some suspicion or misgiving of lack of conformity with the spirit of the Gospel.

Mr. Cave, who presided over the evening meeting, was apparently not of the number. His impressions were quite of the opposite kind.

He had been astonished at the mildness, the meekness and gentleness and charity which had characterised the speakers at their meetings this year, but although they had avoided personalities, they had exhausted the dictionary for adjectives wherewith to condemn the Church of Rome. He (the speaker) did not hate but he pitied all who were under the trammels of the Church of Rome, and, as an Englishman and a politician, he claimed the right to do his utmost to stem the tide which meant the spiritual ruin of this country. Romanism was fatal to the interests of the family, society and the State. The conviction was that the British nation was a Protestant nation. He did not care how many wolves in sheep's clothing were in their ranks at present, for they would not be allowed to remain there long if he knew his countrymen aright. It was a mere question of time. It was merely a question of weeds, as it was with the man who had neglected his garden, and their duty now was to set to work and clear out the weeds.

The adjectives will not do the least harm. But when Protestantism takes its stand on an English platform to denounce the Catholics of this country as so many "weeds" to be "cleared out," it presents us gratis with an interesting illustration of what it means by the principles of "civil and religious liberty" and of "Christian toleration," which "came into the world by the Blessed Reformation".

From the Clifton meeting the same cry of alarm is forthcoming.

The Vicar of Clifton in his address said :—

Remember that the enemy is coming in like a flood, Romanism and Ritualism are recoiling in Socinianism and Scepticism. A great crisis, I believe, is inevitable, and perhaps much nearer than most men believe. Never was it more needful, therefore, to proclaim always and everywhere salvation by grace. It is that which rebukes infidelity and overthrows the whole fabric of Popery.

Another clergyman closed the proceedings by a prayer—a quite unnecessary one we think—for courage to be still

more outspoken. If his prayer is heard, the report of next year's meeting ought to be one of special interest:—

May God help us to be more and more courageous and outspoken, for there can be no doubt that we are living in perilous times, and God's true witnesses appear to become fewer and fewer every day. I do not believe it is so in reality, and that it only appears so, for there will always be sufficient workers to carry out His plans. Infidelity, Atheism, Ritualism and Romanism are now flooding the land, and we must rise to our privilege to be valiant for the Lord.

The Manchester meeting was opened by a profession of faith:—

The Rev. W. Johnson read a portion of Scripture, and said the Apostle St. John was the only New Testament writer that used the word "Antichrist". The great Antichrist was undoubtedly the representative—the visible representative—of the Romish Church, who was predicted of, as the Apostle John hinted to us, by those who had gone before; by Daniel, by Jesus Christ, and especially by the Apostle Paul in the second chapter of his Second Epistle to the Thessalonians, particularly in verses 4 and 9. There he was described to the life, and he had been doing mischief in the Church of God for 1,500 years. Antichrist had blasphemously sat in the Church of God as God, and forgiving even the sins of the impenitent; by blasphemously granting indulgences to men to break the commandments of God; by setting himself up as an Antichrist in opposition to Christ in his three offices of prophet, priest and king; by bringing in his own lying inventions; and, lastly, and not least, by those lying miracles by which he sought to propagate his doctrines among men—witness, for example, the absurd exhibition of the Holy Coat.

A speaker who followed took a rather gloomy view of the religious state of the country:—

In the last century an open disregard for religion had become the distinguishing feature of the age. There was less religion in England than in neighbouring States, whether Catholic or Protestant. A French writer said there was no religion whatever in England. If the subject were introduced into society it was only to be laughed at, and only four or five members of the House of Commons attended church. This, if not strictly true, had a good deal of truth in it. There were a few good men, however, who remained to preach the truth, and hold aloft the Gospel of Christ. Our Evangelical fathers were few and far between.

The following, we hope, registers the low-water mark of Christian feeling and good taste to be found in any religious body in this country:—

Mr. Foulkes said Archdeacon Barber of Chester had said that the Bishop of Chester sanctioned procession headed by a cross-bearer on special occasions; that such processions were harmless, and that the cross was a symbol of our religion. He (the speaker) denied that it was a symbol of our religion. It was a symbol of a Roman gibbet. They might as well put a gallows on their chimney-piece as a symbol of Palmer, the murderer. Bread and wine and water were the emblems of the Christian religion, and these were sufficient.

.....

An Archdeacon, who spoke next, was less than complimentary in his metaphors:—

The priests of Baal might be in a majority, but they, who held fast the faith, must be content to be like the just prophets that had gone before. Romanism was spreading in the Church of England. There were many lovers of Evangelical truth in the Church, but we could not stir them up. Some of the laity were the same. They could not believe that the Church was in such danger as some of the Evangelical party supposed, and it was like flogging a dead horse to try and awaken them to a sense of their responsibilities and dangers.

.....

Another speaker, whose name is closely associated with the cause of Protestant defence or defiance in Manchester, suggested a principle of belief and worship, in which easy-minded Church-goers might find some measure of consolation:—

He said that they did not know where the Jesuits were. The members of that union were Protestants—Protestants against errors—maintainers of the truth. They should protest against any Romish innovations in their churches, and stand firm. He had been driven out of his own church, where he had worshipped twenty-five years, on account of the letters he had written in the press against Romish errors. It were better that they should read their Bibles at home and worship God there than patronise Romanism in their churches. Let them not take their inspiration from parsons, who were merely men like themselves, but from the Word of God. He had given over reading commentaries for that very reason. Christ would teach them; and if they did not understand a passage in the Bible, let them read it over and over again, and the Holy Spirit would teach them its meaning.

The speaker neglected to explain why under such circumstances the Holy Ghost apparently teaches him a meaning which is exactly opposite to the one which presumably He teaches his Ritualist neighbour next door.

The same speaker added in a few terse words his appreciation of the Anglican Bishops :—

It was in the Church of England now that the Bishop's carriage stopped the way. There might be some present at the meeting who admired Bishops. He didn't. He did not hesitate to declare that if the Bishops of the Church had been faithful to their ordination vows, the Church would not be in the position she was at the present time. They must be brought down from their watch-towers and driven hence. Away with such men. We would not have them.

An Archdeacon added to his testimony that

There were the dangers of formalism and retrogression ; and Romanism was spreading day by day, month by month, and year by year.

Truly a contrast to the Congress at Rhyl!

And these are the men with whom pious Anglicans who hold the doctrines of the Christian priesthood, the Christian Sacrifice and the Real Presence as a sacred and blessed heritage of the "Faith delivered to the Saints," are content to kneel in communion.

Truly there is nothing so fearfully comprehensive as the Church of England.

But it is a "comprehensiveness" which the Fathers of the Church and the earlier Councils would have spurned beneath their feet as a treason to Christ and a denial of Catholicity.

CHAPTER XXXVI.

English Church History at an English Church Congress.

(31ST OCTOBER, 1891.)

THE Church Congress at Rhyl in 1891 was a public plea against the Disestablishment in Wales.

The chiefest part of the plea was necessarily that which

went to enforce the indissolubility of the Anglican Church in Wales with the same Church in England.

But here the point which above and beyond all others required to be driven home and riveted in the conscience of the public was the fact that the Church in Wales and the Church in England are historically one.

That is the proposition which most of all needed proving. It is also the one which of all is the hardest to prove. It is a brief which it requires some courage to handle. The more the holder of it happens to know about the historical evidence, the greater the call and the strain upon his courage is likely to be. It was placed in the hands of the Archbishop of Canterbury.

The Congress, itself an objective of public attention at the moment, was an unrivalled opportunity for putting before the public in the most earnest and scientific manner the complete historical evidence for the bond between the British and English Churches.

The opportunity has been missed.

Instead of a serried legion of historical proofs, one finds in the Archbishop's address nothing but a few straggling historical allusions.

Stranger still, the allusions thus made are seemingly of singularly unhappy selection.

Anglican controversialists are apparently accustoming themselves to think and to speak of the British Church as the mother of English Christianity.

How far has such a notion any real foundation in historical fact?

The British Church along with the British nation was driven into Wales in the earlier half of the fifth century. Their invaders, the Angles, Jutes and Saxons, were not converted until the very end of the sixth. Thus, for almost two centuries during which the two peoples stood side by side in this land, we have no proof whatever that the British Bishops ever lifted a finger towards the conversion of their English neighbours.

On the other hand, we have positive proof that this evange-

lisation was just the work which the British Church most flatly and persistently refused to undertake (Bede, *Hist. Ecc.*, xi., 2).

When, finally, the English were converted, the work was achieved by missionaries, not from Britain, but from Rome or from Iona.

Even then, and for a century afterwards, there still remained between the two Churches a wall of separation, and there is little or nothing to show that they either sought the help or friendship of the other.

On the other hand, there was constant intercommunion between the British and Irish Churches. If we can persuade the Irish Church to forget its traditions of St. Patrick's Roman mission and the fact of his non-British consecration and his Gallic training, and allow us to look upon him nevertheless simply as a missionary from Britain, then the British Church might be conceived as the mother of the Church in Ireland. On the other hand, the Irish Church was certainly the mother of the Scottish Church founded by St. Columba in Iona. The Church at Iona was equally the mother of the Church of Lindisfarne, and the restored Church of Northumbria and Mercia.

Thus it could be said—and it is the most that could be said—that the English Church in its northern half is the great-granddaughter of the British Church.

That is one way, and the only way of dealing with the wall of separation which history tells separated the Church in Britain from the Church in England.

But the connection is made only by travelling a very long way round. If Celtic faith found its way, after some centuries, to the English side of the wall, it was certainly not British Churchmen who carried it.

In the account of the whole work of the evangelisation of the English and the formation of the English Church, it would be hopeless to look for the name of a single notable British missionary.

If that is the case, can it be quite honest to speak of the English Church as the “daughter of British Christianity”?

But there is an exception.

During the long centuries which comprise the formative period of the English Church, and extending to a date long after its organisation had been consolidated by Theodore, there is at least one single instance of ecclesiastical contact between the English and British Churches.

When St. Chad was consecrated by Bishop Wini of Wessex, two British Bishops assisted at the consecration.

A fact so slender and solitary of its kind could hardly afford a foundation on which to build a theory of public communion between the two Churches.

But even this exceptional instance has to be discounted.

First, St. Chad did not seek consecration from the British Church but from the Roman succession at Canterbury. It was only when he found that Archbishop Deusdedit was dead that he went to Wessex.

Secondly, in Wessex, he was consecrated, not by British Bishops, but by Wini, the Saxon, who had received his orders from the Catholic Bishops in France. Two British Bishops *assisted* at the consecration. Even they were not of the British observance, but converts to the Catholic and canonical use in celebrating Easter.

Thirdly, the consecration thus effected was almost immediately discredited and repudiated by the English Church, and St. Chad himself practically disavowed it by submitting to have his consecration regularised by Archbishop Theodore, of the Roman succession, who as St. Bede tells us (iv., 2) "completed his ordination after the Catholic manner".

With what favour the early English Church looked upon any succession of orders from the British Church may be gathered from the ninth chapter of Penitential of Theodore, which regards ordination by British or Scottish prelates as heretical, and requires any one who has been so ordained to receive anew the imposition of hands from a Catholic Bishop.

In the light of such facts, the following passages in the Archbishop's address can hardly be read without some surprise:—

Truer, historically, would it be to speak of "the Church of Wales in England" than of "the Church of England in Wales". For the succession of Augustine died out strangely soon, but the Celtic consecrators of St. Chad, with the Northerners who came from Aidan, have their successors in every see.

Three misstatements in five lines.

First, the Church of Wales or the British Church never came as a Church into England. For centuries after the founding of the English Church there was next to no communication between them. The Scottish or Irish Church came: but if that is what the Archbishop means, and the connection is through the Irish Church, then what becomes of his argument for non-disestablishment, and his anxiety to get rid of the Irish precedent?

Secondly, the Roman succession of Catholic Orders given to Augustine by the Papal Vicar at Arles never died out in the See of Canterbury. When Augustine died, Lawrence, Mellitus, Justus, Honorius and Deusdedit all had their orders from the same non-British succession. Theodore, who did the main part in the organisation of the English Church, was himself consecrated by the Pope, and imprinted this same succession upon the face of the whole English hierarchy.

Theodore's action with regard to St. Chad is ample proof that it was the Roman succession that was sternly insisted upon, while the British succession was not even suffered to enter into the creation of the early English Episcopate.

And yet the Archbishop of Canterbury does not hesitate to address the Welsh Church as the "fountain of our Episcopacy"!

But you, who are our eldest selves, the fountain of our Episcopacy, the very designers of our sanctuaries, the primæval British dioceses, from whom our very realm derives its only title to be called by its proudest name of Great Britain, I come from the steps of the chair of Augustine, your younger ally, to tell you that, by the Benediction of God, we will not quietly see you disinherited.

These are truly the kind of assertions which can be made—wisely or unwisely—in a rhetorical appeal. They are not the kind which could easily have found a place in a sober

historical statement. They traverse two facts which are staple-matter of English history—the non-communication of the British with the English Church, and the repudiation of British orders in the early English consecrations.

Rhetoric passes but history remains.

CHAPTER XXXVII.

Anglicanism and the Doctrine of Purgatory.

(14TH NOVEMBER, 1891.)

THE Commemoration of All Souls celebrated in the Anglican Churches has a registration value.

It marks the progress made during the course of the year by the Anglican mind in its return-journey to the doctrine of Purgatory and Prayers for the Dead.

Three hundred years ago Anglicanism turned its back upon the Saints and the Souls. It sternly refused to pray for the one, or to ask the prayers of the other. After centuries of estrangement we witness the beginnings of a reconciliation. We love to see in such facts the luminous foreshadowing of a reconciliation with the Church militant as well, and pray that those who seek so devoutly Catholic brotherhood in Heaven and in Purgatory may not be denied the happiness of finding it also on earth.

Requiem services were held at noon on All Souls' Day in the churches of St. Ethelburga, St. Edmund's King and Martyr, and St. Margaret Pattens.

An account of the ceremony at the last-mentioned church is given in *The Church Review*. One may note that another point upon which the Anglican movement reports progress is the undisguised use of the word "Mass," in lieu of the more hesitating formulas, "Communion Service," "Eucharist," or "High Celebration":—

The church was fairly well filled, and most of those present were in black. The altar was vested in black, and bore no ornaments save two lighted yellow wax tapers and a crucifix. The priest who sung Mass wore black vestments, and was attended by the usual acolytes, incense being offered at the proper places in the service. Palestrina's music was sung by the choir in the perfect manner one

is accustomed to in this church. A long list of the names of the departed, for whom the prayers of the congregation were asked, was read by the Rector. This took a considerable time, and might, I think, have been abbreviated, especially as, unless I am mistaken . . . it included the names of King Edward I. and others of equally ancient date.

King Edward I. died in 1307.

He was not a very notorious sinner as Kings go. He would probably have sworn some hideous Plantagenet oath, and employed one or more of the rough and ready Plantagenet methods to any one of his subjects who would have presumed to deny the authority of the Apostolic See, and especially to any demented cleric who would have attempted to say a Mass for the soul of the King's grace in a vernacular and unapostolic liturgy.

That the congregation of St. Margaret's should believe that the King is still in the position to have need of their prayers, implies at first sight an earnest belief not only that Purgatory exists, but that the detention of souls in Purgatory is of seriously long duration.

However, Anglicans have excellent precedents for their practice.

The Catholic Church herself sanctions the saying of Masses even in perpetuity for deceased benefactors. She never forgets that the application of all Masses is in the hands of Him who "disposeth all things in mercy," and knows that when the benefactors have passed from Purgatory to receive the full reward of their benefactions, the benefit of the Masses which continue to be offered for them will pass from souls that need it not to souls that need it most.

We may fairly assume that, on this point, the Anglican belief tends to become more nearly one with our own.

The service above mentioned was marked by the uprising of a curious liturgical difficulty. It is one which reveals on the surface the undercurrent of the contending forces which sway the conscience of Anglican worshippers.

Anglicans wish to adhere loyally to the authorised Prayer-book, neither adding to or detracting therefrom. They wish

at the same time to observe, not less loyally, the rules which are prescribed by ancient and Catholic custom. But it is difficult to be true to both loyalties when the Prayer-book insists that certain parts of the service shall be said, when Catholic custom with equal clearness insists that the said parts shall be omitted.

For instance, the Prayer-book requires that in the Anglican service the Confession, Creed and *Gloria* shall be recited. But every one knows that in a Catholic Mass for the dead it is a distinctive part of the solemnity that these three parts should be excluded.

At St. Margaret's the problem was solved by a compromise. It was one which would certainly not have occurred to the majority of liturgical experts.

In deference to the prescribed integrity of the English service, the Confession, *Gloria* and Creed were *not* left out, but with equal deference to Catholic custom they were said in a *low* tone of voice.

I was gratified to find that our English Mass was not mangled here in the way it is sometimes at Requiem services. The Creed, Confession and *Gloria in Excelsis* were not omitted, but said in a low tone by priest and people.

Liturgical compromises are certainly not more lovely than doctrinal ones. Not the less, one cannot but view with sympathy and respect the devotional yearning for Catholic standards which strains almost to the snapping-point the cold, hard, iron bonds which the Protestant hand of Cranmer forged around the Reformation Prayer-book.

At St. Alban's, Holborn, the ceremonial was at least several degrees more courageous and outspoken.

There is, I believe, a Canon (No. 14—A.D. 1604) in the Established Church which commands that "All ministers shall observe the orders, rites and ceremonies in the Book of Common Prayer," and "in the administration of the Sacraments," "without either diminishing" or "adding anything in the matter or form thereof".

At St. Alban's, scruples as to the lawfulness of leaving unsaid parts of the service required by the Prayer-book were not allowed to mar the higher law of compliance with

Catholic custom. The Confession, Creed and *Gloria* were frankly left out.

But even then the difficulties of adaptation were not at an end.

It was a case of not only excluding what the Prayer-book introduced, but of including what the Prayer-book had failed to provide. On the one hand, a Requiem service for All Souls would be clearly inconceivable without a Collect for the Dead. On the other hand, there is no such Collect to be found within the covers of the Book of Common Prayer.

And for the best of all reasons.

It was precisely the form of prayer of which the Reformers had been most careful to remove all trace from the Anglican formularies.

In the Prayer-book of 1549 there was an intercession for the "*whole* state of Christ's Church," and it was followed by a prayer for the souls of the faithful departed.

The compilers of the Prayer-book of 1552 aimed a straight and trenchant blow at this remnant of the ancient Catholic service.

First, they made their meaning carefully understood by significantly limiting the expression "whole Church" by the words "militant here on earth". Secondly, they dealt with the prayer for the dead simply by sweeping it out of their liturgy.

To make their intention perfectly clear, they inserted in the Articles of Religion an approbation of the Homilies as "godly and wholesome doctrine," while they put forth in the Homilies thus approved the following plain statement:—

Neither let us dream any more that the souls of the dead are anything at all holpen by our prayers; but as the Scripture teacheth us, let us think that the soul of man, passing out of the body, goeth straightways either to heaven or else to hell, whereof the one needeth no prayer, and the other is without redemption (Hom. xix.).

Little wonder that the directors of the ceremony at St. Margaret's could find little to their purpose in the Anglican Prayer-book.

.

The missing Collect was sought at its authentic source. It

was borrowed from the Roman Missal. It is to be presumed the Absolutions of the Dead were taken at the same time.

The Church Review summarises these successes in the structure of an eclectic liturgy in a few lines :—

The word “full,” however, but feebly describes the crowds which thronged St. Alban’s on Monday at the Requiem Mass in connection with the Guild of All Souls. . . . The Commandments, Creed and *Gloria* were omitted, the Collect was from the Roman Missal, and the Absolution of the Dead was substituted for the Blessing.

The sermon which followed the service was certainly not upon the lines of the Homilies.

They owed another duty to the dead : they must pray for them, that more light may be granted to them, more peace given to them, and more rest vouchsafed to them. We must not only think of our shortcomings towards our loved ones when they were taken from us. We must not merely do that—we must not merely think of them, even if it be with the fondest love—we must pray for them.

The conclusion of the ceremony is described as follows :—

The service concluded with the censing of the catafalque (on either side of which three unbleached candles were burning) and the pronouncing of the Absolution of the Dead (the officiant being vested in a black cope), after which the congregation departed in solemn silence, no voluntary, funeral or otherwise, being played.

The above is almost as explicitly Roman as a sermon on Purgatory, preached at St. Mary’s, Munster Square (to a “Confraternity of the Blessed Sacrament”). It will show how closely, and yet more closely, the Anglican mind is drawing near to the doctrine as taught by the Catholic Church :—

They were assembled there to do a great act of charity towards the dead, to fulfil a great duty towards them, and not merely for the sake of keeping their memory green, as the world does. We had much more to do than that : we had an intercession to make for the dead, and that was founded upon this distinction which he had tried to draw between the temporal and the eternal punishment for sin. For while God remitted the eternal punishment for repented sin, He did not necessarily remit the temporal punishment, part of which is the penalty of death. For the vast majority of Christians the temporal punishment must be paid in the world to come, and the souls in Paradise, because they had not taken up

their cross here, and not been mindful of the example of Our Lord, are offering the homage of their spiritual suffering in the realms of Purgatory, and were helped by our prayers and Eucharists offered in their behalf.

Here the preacher has been perfectly honest. He found the doctrine in our books of theology. He made no attempt to gloss or to mutilate. He carried away what he wanted much as it stood, and delivered it from his pulpit. Moreover, in other passages he treated the subject as clearly and exhaustively as if he were holding a brief for the Catholic faith.

It may be doubted if the Anglican Purgatory is quite so much a place of pain as that which is traditionally accepted in the Catholic Church. One may hope that the difference is hardly that which separates two doctrines, but rather that which exists between two opposite sides of the same doctrine.

More correct would it be to say that it is that which lies between a partial and a full (or Catholic) realisation of the same doctrine.

The more the Anglican thinks out the terms of his present belief—the soul fired with love for God's infinite beauty—the soul yearning and thirsting for union with God, yet detained by the need of purification—the more he will find it impossible to eliminate from such a state the idea of punishment. The idea of purification, like the idea of penance, implies soul-suffering. And the more we realise what God is, and the soul is, and what sin is, the more we are likely to understand how terrible the separation, and with it, the "pain of loss," is likely to be.

On the one hand, the precise nature, form or duration of the punishments in Purgatory are no part of the Church's authoritative dogmatic teaching. When we say that Purgatory exists, that souls are there detained and suffer the "debt of punishment," and that they are helped by our prayers, and especially by the Sacrifice of the Mass, we have said precisely all that the Catholic Church has ever found it desirable to define as of faith upon the subject.

Thus Anglicans have not very far to go in this direction to put themselves right with the "mild wisdom" of the Council of Trent.

On the other hand, the beauty and dignity of the soul in Purgatory; its joy and peace in the absolute security of salvation; its transports of love in its newer and closer union with the Holy Spirit; the "joy beyond all earthly joy," which is at once the cause and the counterpart to its "pain beyond all earthly pain"—all these are fair features of the doctrine which Anglicans already descry and admire from afar, but which can only be seen and loved aright in the fulness and nearness and clearness of Catholic faith.

From the happy day on which Anglicanism made up its mind to emancipate itself from the Reformation "and all its works," and take for its ideal all that is ancient and Catholic, a series of fresh developments became inevitable. One of these was the formulation of the doctrine of Purgatory. No one could look the old liturgies in the face without feeling that it is Catholic to pray for the dead. No one could pray for the dead without feeling that there must be a middle state. The ancient prayers which plead that "light refreshment and peace" may be granted to the souls therein detained, imply by the very terms that their condition is one which has need of such benefits, and, therefore, in one form or other, coincides with a state of punishment and purification. Anglicanism has arrived at the point at which it frankly acknowledges the existence of the place, of the people in it, and of their need of our prayers. But here it stops short. It wishes to leave out the pains. A Catholic at once feels that such a conception is mistaken and superficial. But it is not difficult to look behind the formula and give credit for the excellent motives upon which such a conception is based.

In seeking to determine the motives, we may at once dismiss the idea that the omission of the pain-element is due to nothing higher than a mere spirit of petulance by which Anglicanism would seek to have something to its own theological bow and spear to mark it off from a simple following of Romanism. It can have no ambition to construct a Purgatory of its own, as it would the new Church House, on the happiest lines of utility and comfort. A far more probable motive may be sought in the desire to give to the

doctrine a shape which would harmonise readily with antiquity, with the traditions of the East, or with the ethical temper of the present day.

The advantage of seeking the standards of belief in antiquity is obvious. What we find there is solid and secure—as far as it goes. As such it is invaluable, and we have but to read the preamble of any utterance of the Church in modern times, and note how she recites the testimonies of the Fathers, Councils and Popes of past ages, to see how dearly she loves and appreciates the dogmatic harmony which sounds through the centuries. But to accept antiquity not only as the foundation, but as the model of one's beliefs, has a drawback which no thoughtful mind can afford to ignore. It is confining the study of the structure of flower and fruit to an examination of the seeds. Quite true that by the system we may safeguard ourselves from what we consider to be human innovation, but just as likely in doing so, we may shut ourselves out from all share in the fruits of the work of true doctrinal development. That is a fatally high price to pay. To disinherit one's self from the wealth of religious thought and theological insight which has been steadily accumulating in the mind of the Church for ages under the guidance of the Holy Spirit and the secure judgment of the globe, is a sacrifice which it requires a large amount of self-consciousness to accept without regret. Thus a Catholic who, living in the sixth century, looked behind Nicæa for his models of belief on the Person and Divinity of Christ—as the Anglican looks behind Trent—would certainly pay the penalty, and come out with but comparatively poor and rudimentary notions on the *Homoousia* or the Trinity. If, therefore, Anglicanism ties itself down to the Purgatory of the earlier liturgies, the setting aside the living tradition of the Church, and its worked-out results in the domain of theology, its movement to our mind would be retrograde in the unwholesome sense of the word, and its results would be threadbare doctrine covering theological starvation and self-improvement.

However, there may be a better and higher motive for the exclusion of the pain-element from the Anglican Purgatory.

It may be due to a laudable desire to clothe the doctrines of Christianity with that quality of sweet reasonableness and ethical *noblesse* which appeals to every Catholic in the ratio of the height and the depth of his spiritual insight. Men expect to find in the truths of religion all that is beautiful, elevating, ennobling, and naturally seek to exclude from their conception of the Word and Ways of God all that is unworthy, degrading, harsh or vindictive. Hence, if the Anglican has been taught to look upon the Roman Purgatory as a state little better than a sort of penal servitude in which souls have to "do their time" upon something very much worse than the treadmill before entering the heavenly home, one can well conceive why he should shrink from accepting it, and look backward or eastward for a nobler ideal.

Such a misconception can only be due to a want of proportion in estimating the Catholic doctrine of Purgatory. The pain-element is but one of three of which it is made up. Love and happiness are the other two which are inseparably bound up with it. Catholics hold that the condition of souls in Purgatory is far uplifted in dignity, worth and perfection above that of the souls of the faithful on earth. The particular judgment cannot but mean an ineffably intense realisation of God's beauty and love, and the blessed relationship between Him and the soul. Nor can such a realisation exist without firing the soul with an ardently intense love, and the happiness which comes of loving. As the height of the light is the depth of the shadow, the greater the joy and the love, the more intense the pain of separation and the sense of the stain which causes it. If the cleansing fires of the love of the Holy Ghost envelop the soul in their raptures, there cannot but be an element of pain induced by the opposition between the purifying agency and the stain to be purified. The opposition between the Holy Spirit which the soul apprehends and the sin-stain or sin-debt which the soul still retains is, in so far as it exists, vital, and an opposition which is vital—like that between health and the remains of poison in the body—means *pain* or *suffering*. Thus love and joy cannot be other than the very groundwork and the postulates upon which the pain has its *raison*

d'être. "Joy beyond all earthly joy, and pain beyond all earthly pain," was, if I mistake not, Father Faber's description of Purgatory. Then as to sense-punishment, if souls even here on earth were so filled with the yearning of expiation as to delight in their self-inflicted penances and to exclaim, "*Aut pati, aut mori*," how much more readily can we conceive that souls in Purgatory may find the joyous happiness of love's revenge in whatever external punishments God's mercy may be pleased to place within their reach. One may doubt whether such souls would at all be grateful to the Anglican for removing the pain-element, any more than St. John of the Cross or St. Rose of Lima would have thanked their friends for robbing them of their disciplines or their hair-shirts. Love thirsts for expiation to be made to the Loved and Injured One, be it by self or by others, and the true cruelty would be, not in the helping but the hindering of it. The great threefold lesson which the Church gives to mankind upon its God is that He is so good, so beautiful, so lovable that to possess Him is Heaven—to lose Him is Hell—to realise what He is and then to be separated from Him even for a time, is Purgatory. These stupendous doctrines of Catholic eschatology are the triple shadow of God projected upon the future life, and Anglicanism unwittingly maims their meaning when it removes the pathos of suffering love and turns the Middle State into a region of painless and griefless rest with hardly a shade to distinguish it from the heavenly country.

The following extract from a sermon preached on All Souls' Day at St. Mary's, Eastry, may be taken to voice the Anglican view of the condition of the souls departed :—

It is a blessed place, full of manifold refreshments and delights, blessed with the Presence of the Blessed One, in whom all fulness dwells, who is the Light, the Joy, the Peace, the Comfort, the Glory of His saints, and from whose Presence stream forth Love, Joy, Peace, Knowledge and Refreshment infinite. It is a blessed place of growth and progress in love, purity, holiness and knowledge. It is a blessed place, for there the soul begins to taste of such sweetness and blessedness as it has never known before.

To show that there is nothing in this heightening of the lights which is excluded by the Catholic doctrine, we may

compare it with the following passage in Father Coleridge's *Prisoners of the King* :—

“ But we may certainly say, without fear of exaggeration, that no sudden calm that ever fell upon sea or lake . . . could compare with the wonderful change to peace and perfect tranquillity which takes place at the moment of death in the case of those who die in the state of grace. This calm and peace is not in the case of the Holy Souls a passing, but a permanent state, it lasts as long as they remain in the holy prison of Purgatory ; in some respects, it becomes more intense as their period of purification draws towards its close, and then it merges itself into the ineffable repose of the Beatific Vision.”

That such elements of peace, love and joy do not exclude pain or punishment or purgation, but rather by force of the conditions of imperfect union include or postulate them, is a necessary outcome of the Catholic doctrine, and goes to give to it that depth or wholeness of view which, in the Anglican presentment, is so conspicuously wanting.¹

We are not to imagine that the Anglican doctrine of Purgatory—if the Middle State minus purgation can be called by the name—is to remain in the regions of abstract belief. Those who hold it are presumably much too earnest and sincere not to feel that the doctrine carries with it a duty of practical fulfilment. Hence, in another place, we find the sermon at St. Mary's, Eastry, put frankly into practice :—

There was a large and, it need scarcely be said, reverent congregation at St. Alban's, Holborn, on Monday, when the Holy Eucharist was solemnly offered on behalf of all the faithful dead,

¹ The teaching of the Greek Church, while not including apparently the idea of fire, undoubtedly declares Purgatory to be a place of suffering and punishment. Thus the Synod of Jerusalem is quoted by Bishop Neektarios as affirming the just who have not done full penance for their sins to be detained in a place where “ they endure punishment according to, and for the sins they have committed,” and in this state they are “ released by God's goodness in answer to the prayers of the priests and the benefactions done in the name of the departed by their kinsfolk,” and “ of especial avail is the Bloodless Sacrifice offered by each one for his departed kinsfolk, and by the Church Catholic on behalf of all in general every day ” (see *Greek Manuals of Church Doctrine*, by Rev. H. T. F. Duckworth, p. 64).

especially the departed members of the Guild, with a special remembrance of those who had entered into rest since last All Souls' Day. Immediately after the sermon, which was delivered at almost the close of the Divine Office, the celebrant, accompanied by the deacon, aspersed and censed the sides of the catafalque during the recital of the first part of the Lord's Prayer. Absolution, with final versicles and the singing of the beautiful hymn and tune from the Altar Hymnal, "They are not dead, but sleeping," brought a strikingly solemn service to a close.

We may hope that the piety and charity of such worshippers may react upon themselves, and merit for them those graces of light which will lead them from the shadow to the substance and to the one fold which is the true home of the Communion of Saints in all its beauty and fulness.

CHAPTER XXXVIII.

Dr. Plunket and his Ordination of Cabrera.

(12TH DECEMBER, 1891.)

ANGLICANISM has been provided with an "Irish difficulty".

Between the Established Church in England and the Disestablished Church in Ireland there lies a whole volume of differences in conviction, taste, tone and temper, which is very much wider and very much deeper—and often very much rougher—than St. George's Channel. An English Ritualist, who prays for the reunion of Christendom, has next to nothing in common with an Irish Orangeman who is for ever thinking, when he is not shouting, "No Popery".

These cross-Channel differences have lately been brought into prominence by what canonists would call the "case," or diplomats would call the "incident," but what High Church organs in this country have not hesitated to call the "scandal" at Dublin.

The matter might be stated in five acts.

The first act carries us back to a holiday several years ago which Lord Plunket, Anglican Archbishop of Dublin, spent in Portugal. There the Archbishop made a pleasurable discovery. He found a small and struggling sect of Portuguese Protestants banded together under the leadership

of a certain Senhor Cabrera. Senhor Cabrera was a priest who had left the Catholic Church that he might be more free to initiate the work of the Reformation in Spain and Portugal. His new church was in that fascinating stage when everything lies open for the architectural joys of planning, framing, shaping and ordering. It may be doubted if this life presents any artistic pleasure half so subtle or so sweet as that of devising a new liturgy which is to be imposed upon other people. There is the charm of holding the worship of countless souls in the hollow of one's hand.

Senhor Cabrera formed his "Prayer-book" upon the principle of selection. A little was taken from the German service-book, a little from the Anglican; an infusion of local and national colour was secured by taking some harmless prayers from the Mozarabic rite, while point and definiteness were always given when required by adding a good deal of Senhor Cabrera's own. The pieces of this liturgical mosaic, when put together, reflected perfectly the personal predilections of Senhor Cabrera, even more completely than the Second Book of Common Prayer reflected the mind of Cranmer and his fellow-Reformers.

The new-born liturgy was more than fortunate in finding an illustrious sponsor. Lord Plunket beheld in it a Prayer-book after his own heart.

On reflection one can readily understand why.

He had come from Ireland where a bitter war had been waged over the revision of the Anglican Book of Common Prayer. The Low Church and Broad Church factions had joined in an anti-ritualistic "rising," and, despite the touching efforts and appeals of Archbishop Trench, had carried all before them. They had torn the form of absolution from the Visitation of the Sick, abolished the public recitation of the Athanasian Creed, and had done their best to prohibit crosses and candles. They ceased not until they had done all that was humanly possible to stamp out the first beginnings of what Anglicans term the "Catholic Revival". And they did so with all the fierce and alarmed eagerness of men who hasten together to crush the first eruptions of a plague or a conflagration. Lord Plunket was

an active sympathiser with the victorious and thorough-going revisionists. His only complaint was that the work was not carried sufficiently far. He would have preferred to see issue from the hands of the revisers a new Prayer-book which would have left no excuse for those who believe in the Real Presence, and which would contain no pronouncement as to baptismal regeneration, the whole question of which he considers "a profitless controversy". What Lord Plunket dreamed of in Ireland he found realised in Portugal. Senhor Cabrera's Prayer-book was all that he could have wished and prayed that the Irish Prayer-book might have been. Such doctrines as the "supposed Real Presence," priestly absolution and baptismal regeneration were as utterly ignored as if Judge Warren and Lord Grimthorpe had compiled the offices between them. Accordingly, Lord Plunket's heart went forth to the infant liturgy. He practically adopted it, for he even wrote an approving Preface for it, and thus sent it forth honoured by his name and his imprimatur.

The second act is in the Archbishop's Chapel, in Dublin. Lord Plunket had resolved to act as foster-father, not only to Senhor Cabrera's ultra-Protestant Prayer-book, but to the infant Portuguese Church which was destined to use it. He accordingly received with warm fraternal greeting Mr. Cassells, a fellow-worker of Senhor Cabrera, who had arrived in Ireland. In his private chapel the Archbishop ordained him a deacon, and in doing so used the new "Ordinal of Senhor Cabrera".

Such an act has very naturally shocked and disgusted all that was highest and best in the Anglican movement, whether in England or in Ireland.

And with good reason.

It is hard enough to show that Anglicanism is "Catholic" on the strength of the few passages in the Prayer-book that make for the High Church doctrines. Even the very attempt would be wildly impossible when such a slender standing ground had been ruthlessly swept away.

Thus Anglicanism could have no alternative but either

to surrender its own ground, or to reject Senhor Cabrera's Church and liturgy as "Protestant and heretical".

Then arose a difficulty.

How could the Anglican Church claim to be Catholic if one of its Archbishops is openly allowed to ordain a deacon for a sect which it knows to be Protestant?

In other words, Anglicanism finds itself brought face to face and dragged into a fraternal embrace with Protestantism of the most repellent kind, for the Archbishop of Dublin stands grasping the Church of England with one hand at the Lambeth Conference, and with the other clasping his friends the Portuguese sect in his chapel at Dublin.

Little wonder that the Higher Anglicanism recoiled and protested, turned away its face, and loudly shrieked "Scandal".

Lord Plunket maintained his hold. His Portuguese adventure is one for which he showed no signs of sorrow. On the contrary, he was anxious, and ready, and resolved to repeat it at an early opportunity, and on a much larger scale. He openly avowed his intention of completing what he had begun. That means that when Mr. Cassells has to be advanced to what his liturgy calls the order of presbyter, or when Senhor Cabrera cares to be in Spain and Portugal what Bishop Reinkens is in Germany and Switzerland, both will find all that they want, and an Irish welcome besides whenever they choose to come to Dublin.

The third act is in England.

Such a prospect as the above is one which the Higher Anglicanism in this country could not stand by and watch unmoved. If *The Church Times* denounced the ordination of a deacon for the Cabrera sect as the "Dublin Scandal," what word will it have left to describe the consecration of a Bishop?

A ceaseless flood of indignant correspondence has flowed through the columns of the Anglican press. The press agitation has been followed by public action. A memorial has been drawn up for presentment to the Archbishop of Canterbury. It bears the signatures of more than two thousand Anglican clergymen.

After citing the resolutions of the Lambeth Conference the memorialists plead :—

The last of these resolutions, as it appears to your memorialists, was intended to guard against any precipitate and independent action by individual Bishops.

It is, however, matter of notoriety that his Grace the Archbishop of Dublin has lately ordained a deacon to administer to the reforming congregations in Spain. It appears to your memorialists that the action of the Archbishop entails consequences of great gravity. For we submit that (a) it is not loyal to the Lambeth resolution, which required that, as a preliminary to such full recognition as is implied by the Archbishop's action, the Spanish Reformers should have been "enabled to adopt sound forms of doctrines and discipline," and to "secure Catholic organisation". But it does not appear to us that anything has been done to satisfy the Church that these conditions have been fulfilled, whereas grave fears have been expressed whether the "Revised Prayer-book of the Reformed Spanish Church" is in harmony with the teaching of the English Book of Common Prayer. And (b) it appears to claim a right for any individual Bishop to confer Holy Orders on members of any religious body on his own sole responsibility and on his own judgment of the soundness of the "form of doctrine and discipline" of such body.

Had the consequences of the action of the Archbishop concerned only the Church of Ireland, much as we should have deplored the step, we should not have felt entitled to call your Grace's attention to it; but, inasmuch as the Church of Ireland is in close relation with the Church of England, such action cannot but affect the position of the Church of England in the eyes of those outside her communion.

We therefore pray your Grace to take such steps as you may judge expedient to uphold the decision of the Lambeth Conference, and to guard the Church of England from any participation in recognition of forms of doctrine and discipline until such recognition has been sanctioned by her Synods, as well as from the acceptance of the action of his Grace the Archbishop of Dublin as a precedent in time to come.

The memorialists did not specify what steps the Archbishop of Canterbury could take to prevent the Archbishop of Dublin doing, in Spain or Portugal or elsewhere, anything which might commend itself to his judgment.

The fourth act is in Ireland.

The Archbishop of Dublin met the memorial to the English Primate by a letter addressed to the Irish one. Lord Plunket knew his ground, and had excellent reasons

for feeling assured that any battle fought upon his own side of the Channel could result in nothing but victory. He therefore left the matter with perfect confidence in the hands of his Irish brethren in Synod assembled. The result proved the accuracy of his forecast.

The final act is in the Synod of the Irish Anglican Bishops.

Lord Plunket stated his case in a lengthy memorandum. In it he eloquently defends the Cabrera Prayer-book and his own action in intervening to prevent the new Spanish and Portuguese Reformed Church lapsing into Presbyterianism.

The counter-plea, and in it the prayer of the English memorialists, was heard through the voice of the Bishop of Derry. He presented a series of carefully devised resolutions for acceptance by the Synod. They were obviously framed as an eirenicon which might go to secure what would satisfy English Anglicans and at the same time pacify the Irish Reformers.

Thus in front were placed two resolutions which were meant to soothe the followers of Lord Plunket. They were as follows:—

1. We, the undersigned Bishops of the Church of Ireland, express our sympathy with those Christians in Spain and Portugal who are afflicted by the unlawful terms of communion imposed upon them, and who desire a more primitive and Catholic type of doctrine and law of worship.

2. We are anxious that our sympathy should be manifested, not only by prayer for their emancipation from a yoke which grows heavier with the increasing development of doctrine in the Churches of the Roman obedience, but in all other lawful ways. And we respectfully acknowledge the unwearied labour and love of one member of our body on their behalf.

Then came two others in the interest of the memorialists:—

3. At the same time we deprecate any action which (to use language of authority to which we have all assented) does not “regard primitive and established principles of jurisdiction and *the interests of the whole Anglican Communion*” (“Conf. of Bishops of the Anglican Communion,” s. 15 (e)).

4. We therefore earnestly desire that there shall be no further ordination of priests or deacons for the Reformed Church of Spain and Portugal by any of our number, pending communication with those who are competent to judge how the whole of the great communion of which we form a part is likely to be affected by such action.

Thereupon followed a fifth, which embodied a compromise and a practical suggestion :—

5. For this end we suggest that a consultation should be held between certain of our Bishops appointed by the Archbishop of Armagh and certain of the English Episcopate appointed by the Archbishop of Canterbury, if their Graces in their wisdom will kindly consent, with a special intimation that the prelates selected shall communicate by writing or otherwise with the Scotch and American Bishops, and with Bishops Reinkens and Herzog.

The resolutions were rejected, and, in them, the hopes of English Anglicans.

The Irish Bishops thus pointedly decline to submit the matter to Anglo-Irish arbitration. Moreover, they decline to arbitrate themselves upon it. They leave Lord Plunket perfectly free to do just whatever he pleases, and to carry out his avowed intentions of doing whatsoever he thinks fit for the benefit of his *protégé* Church in Spain and Portugal. The Archbishop is thus left master of the field, and Anglicanism of the higher kind has been taught, not for the first time, that its principles and theories are but as many cobwebs when they stand in the way of the vigorous Protestantism of Ireland.

The Anglican press on this side of the Channel is naturally outspoken in its righteous wrath with the Irish Bishops.

Under the heading of the "Dublin Scandal," *The Church Times* reads them a well-deserved lecture. One may doubt if any Roman prelate sharply summoned to the Vatican, *ad audiendum verbum*, ever received quite so severe a reprimand :—

The Irish Bishops have had an opportunity of putting an end to this grave scandal, through the offer of Archbishop Plunket to put himself in their hands, and be guided by their advice. They have lost this opportunity, and they have increased the scandal. By their pusillanimous shirking, and scandalous neglect of duty in refusing to deal in an open and straightforward way with the question submitted to them by Archbishop Plunket, they have not rid themselves of their responsibility any more than Pilate cleared himself by that empty formality of washing his hands. Leaving the Archbishop free to take any course that his idiosyncrasy may suggest, when they had the opportunity of either stopping or guiding his

action, they must be held collectively, and, so far as there are no individual protests, individually accessories before the act to whatever irregularities Archbishop Plunket may commit, and with the wide licence that he allows himself it is impossible to foresee where these will end. This is a very serious state of things for the Irish Church, which is scarcely in a condition to bear such a strain.

What is the matter with the Portuguese or "Cabrera" Ordinal?

It leaves out what High Church Anglicans love best.

In the order for Baptism there is not a word to imply any belief in spiritual regeneration. In the order for Visitation of the Sick the form of absolution is cut cleanly and clearly out altogether. It would be no exaggeration to say that to Anglicans of the higher kind the latter is perhaps the most precious passage between the covers of the Prayer-book.

Hence they indignantly ask Dr. Plunket how he, an Anglican Archbishop, could bring himself to use such an Ordinal!

Perhaps he did not know of its scandalous and heretical omissions.

Yes, he knew all about them. When the Ordinal was published he wrote a Preface for it.

But knowing of them, could he tolerate or sanction them?

Yes. In fact, he assures his critics that he considers these very omissions in the light of improvements. He goes farther to express his "satisfaction" with them, and implies a wish that the Irish Prayer-book could have been reformed in the same direction!

Little wonder that sincere Anglicans in his flock are "filled with despair," and equally sincere Anglicans out of it are filled with righteous indignation.

Amongst the most outspoken exponents of this feeling is the Dean of Durham.

Writing to *The Guardian* he says:—

Many English Churchmen, and I am happy to see many Irish also, will thank you for the remonstrance you have made against the course to which the Archbishop of Dublin has been for some years endeavouring to commit both the English and Irish Church in various parts of the world, but especially in Spain and Portugal.

Not content with Count Campello in Italy, with the painful failure in an attempt to found a new "Church" in Mexico, or with founding one in Spain, he is now founding the "Lusitanian-Catholic-Apostolic-Evangelical Church" (why omit "Protestant"?) in Portugal, by the ordination of a deacon on his own authority, and, it is believed, against the wishes of his Irish brethren; and to direct the doctrines of these bodies he is, it seems, recommending a Prayer-book (having sworn to use the Irish form, and *none other*) in which some of the most distinctive doctrines of his and our own Church, "Baptismal Regeneration," the "Absolution" of the sick, and that in the Ordination of Priests are omitted, to the great satisfaction, as "he honestly confesses," of the Archbishop.

It is clear that if Dr. Plunket wishes to play Cranmer with the Irish Anglican liturgy he will meet with opposition. But it is not at all clear that the opposition would be at all considerable on his own side of the Channel. His General Synod, which removed the rubric on the Athanasian Creed, and which quite recently passed a resolution condemning "Auricular Confession," would probably give him a working majority in a further and much more radical revision of the Irish Prayer-book.

Who, then, will guard the guards?

When a Church is Catholic the whole can correct the part, and the head can direct the whole. But when Churches are "national and autonomous," who shall save them from themselves—from unbelieving primates, or from intolerant or subservient Synods that support and applaud them?

Anglicanism on this side of the Channel is abundantly right in its protest. But, after all, its quarrel should be with its own autonomous system of Church government, and not with its Irish brethren, whose worst crime is that they are making a full and logical use of it.

The earnest men who make such protests, and who feel the breach of a principle as they would a wound, are not surely too clear-sighted not to witness, and witnessing to weigh the disastrous working of the "autonomous" system whether across the Channel or across the Atlantic.

Is an Irish Anglican Primate who eliminates Our Lord's words from the Ordinal so very much more guilty than an

American Anglican hierarchy who have consented to confirm, appoint and to consecrate as Bishop, Dr. Brooks of Boston, who does not believe in the Divine origin of Episcopacy, and who is said to have invited a Unitarian minister to Holy Communion?

Which is the worse? To use a mere book which omits, or to ordain a living man who denies, and to set him as Chief Pastor and teacher over a diocese?

Dr. Plunket did the one. The Anglican Episcopate in America has done the other.

A whole Episcopate practically consecrating a denial of what Anglicans rightly feel to be of all things that which is most sacred and vital in Episcopacy, is surely something which in meaning and magnitude goes far beyond anything which has been done, or is likely to be done, in Dublin.

We cannot be sure that to Anglicans and to ourselves things will be seen even nearly in the same perspective. But if the Dublin incident has a significance sufficient to merit from the Anglican press the designation of a "Scandal," to our mind the Irish "Scandal" is the lesser one of two, and has a wider, a greater and a deeper one beyond it. It stands to the American one in much the same ratio as the Irish Channel does to the Atlantic.

The incident, however, has not happened in vain. The very vehemence of protest and indignation which it has elicited helps to set in clearer relief the pleasing fact that the aim and attitude of English Anglicanism in this last hour of the century are something far higher and nobler than anything which we could have expected to find at the beginning of it. Who shall say what the close of the next may effect in clearing away the after-damp of the Reformation?

In the meantime, the Dublin fact is a speaking one, and it has a lesson to teach to all who are willing to be listeners and learners. It proves across the Channel what Bishop Brooks' election proved a few weeks ago across the Atlantic, that for the main purpose for which both the Church and her Divine Founder came upon earth, namely, that preservation of orthodoxy which "bears witness to the truth," there

never was a theory so hopelessly and helplessly unworkable as the Anglican doctrine of autocephalous churches.

The record of its breakdown is to be found in every land, and Anglicanism itself is both as honest and eloquent as we could wish in proclaiming it.

CHAPTER XXXIX.

The Mitre at Bristol.

(9TH JANUARY, 1892.)

WHAT may be termed the "Mitre Movement" has recently been proceeding apace in the Church of England.

The "Pastoral Staff Movement," by which it was preceded, met with comparatively little opposition. A mitre, however, is a fairly prominent item of Episcopal insignia, and constituted a much more sharp and direct challenge to the videttes of the Church Association.

Naturally the promoters of the movement have had to advance tentatively, and, before attempting an investiture, to choose carefully their ground. No sane person, for instance, would dream of presenting a mitre to Bishop Alford, or to Bishop Ryle of Liverpool, or to the new Bishops of Sodor and Man, or of Carlisle. But there is ample room elsewhere, in dioceses where the Bishops are less restive and more receptive, and where Church temper is of the safe and tolerant kind which makes its protests good-naturedly and with folded arms. The latest and by far the most risky experiment of the kind was made at Bristol.

At Bristol the forces of the Low Church and High Church, though by no means equal, are at least sufficiently balanced to prevent either party ignoring completely the strength or susceptibilities of the other. The long dispute over St. Raphael's had maintained amongst both a certain amount of camp feeling, and their differences had "memories" which made them slow to slumber. The Higher Anglican party had already won a substantial victory in the reopening of St. Raphael's, and, in a modified sense, could claim to have captured the Bishop. Like wise and energetic strate-

gists, they were swift to follow up their success. They resolved to go farther, and to crown the Bishop with a mitre—the latest of Anglican adoptions—an act of prowess equivalent to planting their flag on the summit of the diocesan citadel.

The presentation of the mitre appears to have placed the Bishop in a difficulty. He was too courteous to offend the donors by declining to use it, and too gentle to wish to offend the Low Church section of his people by wearing it. It is not easy to conceive, much less to find, a *via media* between taking a mitre off and keeping it on. The only possible solution would lie in manipulating the mitre, and in dealing with the problem after the manner which the scholastics describe as *in sensu diviso* (literally, now off, now on).

The time of the test came on Christmas Day, and the hour of service found the Cathedral filled to witness it. A strong body of indignant Low Churchmen were there in sufficient force to make, if need be, a public protest. The *via media* and the solution *in sensu diviso* saved the situation, and carried the Bishop safely through the difficulty.

Proceeding with the procession through the cloisters, the Bishop wore the mitre, and thus fulfilled his promise to the donors. But emerging into the church, and coming in "sight of the enemy," the Bishop took off the mitre, and carried it in his hand. As the adversaries of the mitre remained rather to watch than to pray, the Bishop contented himself with his skull-cap, and never once resumed the mitre during the service. On leaving the Cathedral, and re-entering the cloisters, the mitre was replaced, and thus by a careful allotment of nave and cloister, putting on and putting off, the Bishop divided his favour and satisfied both parties—or neither party—as the case may be.

The Guardian describes the incident in the following terms:—

At the morning service at Bristol Cathedral on Christmas Day there was a very large congregation, it having been announced that the Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol would wear for the first time the cope and mitre presented to him some weeks since. A prominent member of the Church Association attended the service, and,

according to a report which appeared in the daily papers, openly expressed his determination to raise a protest in the event of the Bishop putting on the mitre. The service began at half-past ten in the choir, the lower part of which was filled with worshippers. In the procession the Bishop wore the cope and mitre from the Chapter House along the cloisters as far as the entrance to the nave, when he took the mitre off and carried it in his hand. Minor Canon Murchison bore the new pastoral staff in front of the Bishop. . . . When he had taken his seat, the Bishop put on the black skull-cap which he usually wears, and he did not put on the mitre at any time during the service. A number of persons remained to witness the celebration of the Communion, but there was no disturbance. It was stated that at the early Communion a scripture reader attached to one of the parish churches was present, and shouted, referring to the cross and candles on the altar: "What would Dean Elliot have said to this?" After the Communion Service began in the morning, those persons who were standing about in the choir watching to see if the Bishop put on the mitre, were requested to be seated, or not to stand about the aisle. They walked down the nave, and remained watching the Bishop for some time. Towards the end of the service, there being no probability of the mitre being worn, these gentlemen left the cathedral, and the service was shortly afterwards concluded. The Bishop wore his skull-cap all the time: but on entering the cloisters in the returning procession he put on the mitre.

There have been centuries during which Bishops wore no mitres whatever. And there have been instances when Catholic Bishops stood mitred and robed to speak fearlessly, like Archbishop Stratford, the message of truth in the face of their persecutors. But a Bishop, walking in procession in his cathedral, finding it necessary to take off his mitre and carry it submissively in his hand to escape the anger of members of his own flock, is a spectacle which appears to outsiders as happily unique, and unparalleled and unprecedented in Christian history.

No one will blame the peace-loving prelate, nor censure his prudence, even when evinced in such an unheard-of and unheroic compromise. But men may justly conjecture how deep must be the inherent inconsistencies of a system which renders such a spectacle possible or such a compromise necessary. One may ask whether Anglican Bishops have really gained much in the way of Church liberty when they exchanged the rule of the Pope for the rule of their laity. Not even Innocent III. or Hildebrand, in their most master-

ful moods, would have caused an English Bishop to walk mitre in hand before the face of his flock up the nave of his own cathedral.

It is to be feared that the insignia which elicit nothing but reverence from Anglicans of the higher kind, excite feelings of a very different order in the breasts of the masses of their fellow-Churchmen. One would not care to credit Low Churchmen generally with the temper and taste of a churchwarden who writes in last week's *Record*, but his letter, which the organ named has seen fit to publish, may be taken as significant of the frame of mind with which the friends of symbolism have to deal in seeking to realise their views in the externals of worship in the Church of England. He writes:—

I remember once a churchwarden removed, without asking leave, the hat from the head of an ill-conditioned fellow who persisted in keeping it on within the precincts of the parish church. His act was held to be justifiable.

I want to know should I be justified in removing a mitre from my diocesan's head if he wore it within the walls of the church of which I am the *custos*?

The Bristol incident may not be for the Mitre Movement a decisive or a famous victory. But it may be better—a substantial gain and a sure step in advance. The mitre at Bristol will some day come out of the cloister. Its adversaries cannot mount guard for ever, and public opinion trained to see it in the Bishop's hands will not cry out very loudly if some day—even in the nave—it should behold it on the Bishop's head. Thus each New Year's bells ring out more of the older Anglicanism and ring in more of the new.

CHAPTER XL.

Anglicanism and Divorce.

(21ST MAY, 1892.)

AN incident which has recently occurred in the Anglican Communion will be hailed by many as an omen of hopeful significance,

It can hardly be doubted that a large number—we trust the majority—of conscientious Anglican clergymen feel nothing but abhorrence for the doctrine of Divorce, which has been sanctioned by the legislature and put into practice by the Law Courts of this country.

This feeling has found an earnest exponent in the Rev. W. Black, a member of the Anglican religious community known as the Society of St. John the Evangelist, at Cowley.

This Society, if we mistake not, holds in the Anglican Communion the position and prestige of the leading religious Order.

We are told that though relatively small in numbers, the Society is not of diocesan, nor even of national, but of international structure. Its Superior-General rules over several provinces. He may send his subjects to all parts of Great Britain and the Colonies, to India, to Africa or the United States—and he may recall them too, as a certain congregation at Boston, whose tears are not yet dried, has excellent reason to remember.

When one remembers that the founders of this community chose the designation, not of Brotherhood but of "Society"; that they framed its constitution on highly centralised models; that they desired that the name of each clerical member should be preceded by the title "Father"; and then, by selecting St. John the Evangelist as its patron, caused that each name should be followed by the letters S.S.J.E.—one finds oneself at once in the atmosphere of analogies.

We may believe that in all these arrangements the founders were actuated purely by considerations connected with the work and scope of the proposed Society. Or we may believe that they were acting under the unconscious influence and fascination of already existing ideals, and that in the very creation and structure of this Anglican Society, one sufficiently well-known Order of the Catholic Church received in its most practical form the homage of admiration and imitation.

The Rev. W. Black, a member of this Society, has appealed to his Superior-General to be released from his vows. His application is based on motives of the most conscien-

tious kind. He had been engaged in giving a series of mission services in a London church, and had occasion to preach upon the indissolubility of the marriage tie. In this laudable work he was met with a telling rejoinder in the fact that in the very same church and at a spot not farther than a few yards from the very pulpit in which he was preaching, there had been recently solemnised the marriage of a lady who a short time before had divorced her husband. And further, that the so-called marriage had taken place in the church because the vicar of the parish had given his consent that it should be used for that purpose.

Mr. Black very rightly felt that such a ceremony, performed as he would consider it *in facie ecclesiae*, was probably the most public and practical refutation that his bitterest opponent could have given to his teaching, and that there was very little to be gained by his saying No in the pulpit whilst in the more eloquent language of action his fellow-clergymen said Yes at the altar.

He very consistently declined to continue the services.

In taking such a step for conscience' sake, Mr. Black never doubted for a moment that he would be supported by his Superior. The Superior of the Society, however, has not been able to see the matter in the same light. On the contrary, despite many urgent entreaties to stay his hand, he has ordered the Society to resume its work in the parish of the offending vicar.

Thereupon, as a public protest against the ecclesiastical sanction and shelter thus openly given to the marriage of divorced persons, Mr. Black has applied for a release from his vows, and has written to the Church papers to make public the fact that he has done so.

It is unnecessary to say that into any question which might arise between Mr. Black and the Society of which he was a member Catholics cannot have the faintest possible wish to inquire. But the indissolubility of marriage is one of the highest and holiest interests of national morality, and one in which all members of the commonwealth are bound by religion and patriotism to be deeply concerned.

By the right thinking public at large, and most of all by Catholics, the earnest protest we have described will be welcomed as at least one item of help in the formation of a higher and healthier level of the national conscience.

A second item, and one which for many reasons is hardly less remarkable, presents itself in the columns of *The Church Times*.

This organ of advanced Anglicanism has entered upon what it very fittingly describes as a crusade against the Divorce law.

It is satisfactory to note that in beginning to preach this crusade it takes its stand upon purely Catholic ground, and that it even borrows from Catholic theology the well-known technical terms of precision which alone can set forth the doctrine of Christian marriage with steel-like sharpness and clearness.

It holds that there can be no divorce *a vinculo matrimonii*, and that owing to this impregnable subsistence of the *vinculum* or bond, the contracting parties, while they may be judicially separated, cannot be parted in the sense that they are free to re-marry.

Every one will recognise in the above the traditional teaching of the Catholic Church. Had it been given to the editor of *The Church Times* to have lived in the days of Henry VIII. and of Cranmer, and to have spoken his mind one-half so clearly, he might now have been commemorated upon the list of our English martyrs.

The Catholic doctrine of marriage is marked off from the Reformation concepts by a plain and pregnant difference.

The Church holds that Christian marriage is a covenant, not of Two, but of Three.

Into the covenant enter not only Two—man and woman. Man is never greater than himself, and were it purely a covenant of the two, what man had tied man could untie.

But into the covenant enter Three—man and woman and God—man and woman taking and accepting each other, and God, in the grace of a Sacrament, accepting and sealing the union of both.

Hence those who marry enclose themselves in a sacred *vinculum* or bond, the ends of which are irrevocably held in the unchangeable hand of God.

It is this inclusion of the immutable God in the marriage contract which imparts to it the quality of indissolubility, and places the fixity of bond once and for ever above and beyond the reach of the parties themselves, or of any earthly power that might seek to relax it.

While the bond remains they are husband and wife "until death does them part".

God has joined them together, and those who are thus joined, man, even when he sits in the Chair of St. Peter, cannot separate.

The Church Times in setting forth the Catholic teaching upon the indissolubility of marriage, nails up the rather desperate thesis that this doctrine has at all times been taught and held by the Anglican Church:—

It cannot be too often asserted that the Church of England knows absolutely nothing of Divorce *a vinculo matrimonii*. There is no such thing in the Church. There is judicial separation; but in all cases re-marriage is forbidden, wherever there has been a *valid* marriage. Separation with the right to re-marry is not only unknown to the Church, but positively condemned and disallowed.

One could heartily wish that it were so, or even now that it will be so!

But hardly has the writer made this astounding requisition upon the faith of his readers than he follows it up by a statement which to Catholic ears seems little short of appalling.

He adds:—

It is competent to any clergyman to consider on the grounds of social expediency the propriety of allowing the innocent party to re-marry. That is a different thing from pretending that this right exists within the Church.

What are we to think of it?

Only just now he has told us that there is no divorce from the *vinculum* or bond of matrimony!

That obviously means—if it means anything—that even when a decree *Nisi* has been granted the bond remains,

and the parties are still, and must ever continue to be, in the eyes of God and the Church husband and wife.

Yet when a lady who has divorced her husband comes asking to be united to another man of her choice, we are assured that it is competent to any clergyman, "on grounds of social expediency," to consider the propriety of allowing her to re-marry!

In other words, "*on grounds of social expediency*" the Anglican clergyman may allow the lady to have two husbands! And because the lady is the innocent party, he may allow the gentleman to marry his neighbour's wife!

Truly the writer has written a sentence too much for his thesis.

When *The Church Times* maintains that the indissolubility of marriage has always been the doctrine of Anglicanism, it seems to be unaware that it is therein really laying the grounds for the most damaging indictment that could be brought by her worst enemies against the Church of England. The fact will be made clear by a moment's analysis.

Let us take the writer at his word.

We, *pro formâ*, accept his statement that according to the doctrine of the Anglican Church, those who have been validly married remain husband and wife, and no power can loose the *vinculum* or bond of matrimony which unites them.

We are in an Anglican Church.

Before the altar stand two persons, whom we shall call John and Jane. Jane (an innocent party) has divorced her husband and comes now to be married to John.

The Anglican clergyman performs the marriage service.

What precisely does it mean?

Accepting *The Church Times'* statement as true, it means three things.

First, it means that John and Jane are not and cannot be made man and wife, as Jane is still the wife of another husband.

Secondly, it means that these two persons, John and Jane, are deliberately sent from this altar to live together in sin.

Thirdly, it means that this adulterous union is actually

solemnly blessed by the prayers and ritual of the Anglican Church.

An immoral union is at all times sad and scandalous enough, but such a union, blessed by the ceremonies of religion, is a horror of immorality and of detestable profanity.

No one will blame for a moment the contracting parties. They are doubtless in good faith, and had they not been assured that by civil law and Church practice they were free to contract marriage validly, no marriage on their part would for a moment have been attempted.

Then one naturally turns from them to the Anglican clergyman (who presumably knows what *The Church Times* declares to be the unfailing doctrine of his Church) to ask how it is possible that he can suffer himself to prostitute his office and make himself an active agent in the scandalous function?

But easily enough the clergyman can defend himself. He can draw from his desk and hold out to us a licence signed and issued by the Anglican Bishop, authorising him to perform this ceremony. The law apparently compels Anglican Bishops to do so, and for more than thirty years Anglican Bishops have constantly and complacently done so.

From this point the indictment plainly resolves itself into two alternative counts:—

(A) Either the Anglican Episcopate know that, according to the doctrine of the Church of England, the bond of matrimony is in all cases indissoluble—in which case they have knowingly and wilfully authorised their clergy to use the forms of their Church to bless unions which they know to be sinful, and have sent persons with the sanction of these forms to live in sinful connection.

The proposition is monstrous, and we only frame it to dismiss it as unthinkable.

(B) Or, the Anglican Episcopate do not know that, according to the doctrine of the Church of England, the bond of matrimony is in all cases indissoluble—in which case we have a Church in which the Bishops are themselves convicted

of being culpably ignorant of the very law and doctrine of the Church of which they are held to be the guides, the guardians and the rulers.

And that on one of the gravest issues of national morality!

And to such an extent that they need at this hour of the century to be thus taught and set right by *The Church Times* :—

We deplore the fact that the Bishops issue a form of marriage licence to divorced persons in accordance with the requirements of the Divorce Act. If the law of the State is in conflict with that of the Church in matters which have been always deemed essential by the latter, flat refusal to comply is the bounden duty of every Churchman, clerical or lay, at all risks and at any cost. The Bishop's licence for the re-marriage of a divorced person, innocent or guilty, not only carries with it no authority, but ought to be absolutely ignored by the clergyman to whom it is presented.

An Episcopate sanctioning what it knows to be immorality sealed by Church ritual, or an Episcopate blind to the doctrine and teaching of its own Church, are not pleasant alternatives.

But—postulating always *The Church Times'* thesis—it is hard to see how there could be any logical escape from one or other of them.

For ourselves we accept neither of them.

The Anglican Bishops are much too conscientious to be the one, and much too learned to be the other.

But if we are permitted to believe so, it is only by utterly setting aside the contention that the “ Anglican Church knows nothing of Divorce *a vinculo matrimonii* ”.

And yet, if the Anglican press feels the need of such a theory for its crusade against the doctrine of divorce—a theory which requires us to close our eyes as firmly to logic as the continuity theory requires us to close them to history—and if even at the risk of wounding its hands it is wishful to wield it as a weapon in defence of the marriage bond, and in striking a blow at the Divorce Court, who is there amongst us that will not gladly wish it well in its warfare, and trust that the victory may be won not the less brilliantly for the bending bayonet that was used to achieve it.

CHAPTER XLI.

**A Picture of Low Church Anglicanism—
What they think of us.**

(4TH JUNE, 1892.)

THERE is a side—the farther side—of Anglicanism which claims our notice were it nothing more than as a recognition of the interest which it has been moved to take in our spiritual condition.

The tone and temper and aspirations of the evangelical section of the Anglican Church are revealed at their best in the May meeting at Exeter Hall.

At the meeting of the Protestant Reformation Society, the object of the organisation was explained by the Chairman in the following terms:—

The objects of the Society were twofold, namely (1) the salvation of Catholics by showing the unscriptural nature of much of their teaching, and presenting the Truth in love through the one only Mediator, Jesus Christ; and (2) the preservation of Protestants who were assailed by plausible pretensions or in danger of being perverted by Romish agency. It was essentially non-political and Christian in its character, and had not any quarrel with persons or individuals. Its operations extended over England and Scotland, and were carried on by carefully trained missionaries, who lectured, held discussions and classes, and otherwise laboured among Roman Catholics, seeking to bring them to Jesus—and who visited and conferred with Protestants exposed to the attacks of Romanism, or in danger of being severed from their allegiance to Christ. The Society from time to time published and distributed books and tracts on the Romish controversy suitable for the instruction both of Protestants and Roman Catholics.

We take it that the very existence of such a society is a practical proof of the earnestness and sincerity of those who belong to it. Were its members not deeply convinced of the truth of their position, we cannot easily conceive that they would take so much trouble to draw us over, or to keep their less vigilant brethren from falling into our hands, or into those of our accredited receiving-agents, the Ritualists. No doubt their zeal may at times wax warm with the anger that sins not. It would hardly be zeal if it did not. As a result words are spoken which lay the speakers fairly open to the charge of narrow-minded prejudice and bigotry

—which is not good for them—and a mental atmosphere is created in which everything concerning the Catholic Church is seen as through a distorting medium—which is not good for us—and, finally, they are tempted to hate and denounce us as enemies of Christ and of England, while we are tempted to forget their conscientiousness, and to treat their angry jeremiads with contempt or raillery—a form of temptation which cannot be good for either of us.

The words in which the Chairman followed up his explanation are a fair sample of the distorting tendency referred to:—

That was, however, the only Society which carried on a mission to the Roman Catholics of Great Britain. In the present age, when there was so much spurious liberalism and false notions of charity prevailing, it was not surprising that Romanism and its ally Ritualism continued to progress. It was not impossible that the prediction contained some time ago in a leading article in *The Weekly Register* might come true. Referring to the Romanising movement, that paper said: “It, no doubt, will progress until the day when High Mass will once more be sung in Westminster Abbey”. As was remarked by the late Bishop Bickersteth (of Ripon) at the Annual Meeting of that Society, “Romanism was a masterpiece of subtlety and ingenuity employed for the purpose of entrapping the ignorant into the meshes and entanglements of error”. Now (proceeded the Chairman) the Romish system never changed. It was *semper eadem*. Its powers might be held in abeyance, only, however, because it was not convenient or expedient to enforce them; but given the circumstances which would make it prudent or useful to put those powers into force, and there was not the slightest doubt that they would be in active operation, and the fires of Smithfield, either there or elsewhere, would again be lighted, and the same persecutions prevail as in previous periods of their country’s history.

Here the speaker misapprehends the sameness of our system. Undoubtedly the Church is unchangeably the same in her principles and her teachings, but it is a part of that serpent-like “subtlety” which the speaker had observed to be characteristic of the Church, and which was recommended to her not less than dove-like simplicity by her Divine Master, that her methods should change from age to age, and be adapted to the ethical environment in which they are employed.

Thus the Chairman, and those who listened to him, may well rest assured that when the Mass is said once more in Westminster Abbey, no other fires, save those of Pentecost, are likely to be lighted in Smithfield.

Another speaker, an Anglican clergyman, set forth with considerable clearness the fact to which we have just drawn attention, that much honest-minded solicitude in our regard seems to underlie the foundation and work of such societies :—

He thought they ought to try and stir up others as well as themselves to take a different view and to feel the privilege of working for Roman Catholics. Let them think of the condition of Roman Catholics from the want of knowledge of the Gospel of the Lord Jesus Christ. They were the victims of a wicked imposture—and he could not think how so many Protestants could in these circumstances be apathetic. Had they no feelings for Roman Catholics? Those who were working in this noble cause were sometimes looked down upon as though they were wanting in love to Roman Catholics, but the fact was that they had the deepest and truest compassion for them. And it was because of feelings such as he had described that they joined in the work of such a Society as that in order that they might win them to Christ. He was glad to know that much was being done to prevent Protestants from being perverted to Rome. There was much ignorance among Protestants on these vital questions, but he believed that if the agents of this Society and others would show to the people how impossible it was for Romanism or Ritualism to be true, because the Holy Ghost had never allowed in the Scriptures a minister of the Gospel to be called a sacrificing priest, a great work would be done in fortifying Protestants against the errors of Rome. He fully agreed with a friend of his who, speaking from experience, had stated that it was worth working as a galley-slave for twenty years in order to save one soul from perversion to Rome.

Another clergyman complained—not unreasonably, we think—of the apathy with which the warnings of the Society were received by the Protestant public :—

It seemed as though the land had fallen asleep from the influence of some opiate which had come over them. But he believed that they had touched the bottom at last. There was a growing feeling, particularly amongst laymen, that something must be done, but that would not do it unless somebody did something. He wanted to stir them and to stir himself up to work lovingly, prayerfully, and as those who loved the Lord Jesus Christ, so that when the flood came they should not be overwhelmed. He felt almost tempted

to move an Amendment to the Resolution he was seconding. He should like to see the words "and subtle" inserted after the word "active," for no one word so accurately described the Roman Catholic priest. In Genesis iii. 1 they would read that "the serpent was more subtle than all the beasts of the field," and that was the character of Rome. He had seen Rome at work in England, in Ireland and in Australia, and he had found that Roman Catholics were the most subtle people on the face of the earth. The great need of the day was downright straight-from-the-shoulder hitting. The country must be roused, and they must declare themselves as Protestants, as members of the Church of England, and as followers of Christ.

He concludes by expressing a healthy disregard of popular opinion :—

He knew that the Protestants were now called illiberal, but they must not be afraid of that, and they must call on their friends to come out boldly on the side of Protestantism. The Resolution spoke of the seductive attractions of the Church of Rome. Why were they seductive? Because the doctrines were the doctrines of men. He openly acknowledged that if he were not a Christian he would be a Roman Catholic. The religion taught by Rome was so clever, so logical and so attractive to the carnal mind. He thought that to counteract this they ought to teach their young people to know their Bibles. There was great ignorance amongst the middle and upper classes of the Word of God, and the great need of to-day was for men to read and study and pray over their Bibles.

One cannot but think what a happy factor such zeal and earnestness would be in the religious future of this country if it could be but won for the cause of Catholicity, and turned into the proper direction.

We can only pray that such speakers, breathing threats and slaughter, may pass some day along the road to Damascus.

CHAPTER XLII.

Antichrist in English Church History.

Nor in the particular galley above mentioned, but in one of rather less respectable build, which sails stem to stem with it, we find—not without some measure of surprise—Dr. Bickersteth, the Anglican Bishop of Exeter.

At the Annual Meeting of the "Society for Irish Church

Missions to Roman Catholics," Dr. Bickersteth took the chair, and spoke as follows:—

Romanism is unchanged—it is still the subtlest form of anti-Christianity; and I believe that the word of prophecy, which shines as in a dark place, is the truest safeguard of the Church of Christ against the tremendous evils of Popery. When I sent out a warning voice throughout the length and breadth of my diocese—there were but few persons, perhaps, who were in danger, but I felt it my imperative duty as a Bishop to utter a warning cry lest any should be drawn aside from the simplicity of the faith as it is in Christ—I forwarded to every clergyman a copy of Bishop Wordsworth's book entitled *Is not Rome the Babylon of the Apocalypse?* and I know that that work produced a very great impression. God Himself, foreseeing the future struggles of the Church, gave us what is, perhaps, in some respects the richest part of our inheritance, the Book of Revelations, to unveil the masked features of Popery. We ought not to suppose that Popery is no longer a real foe; God does not generally overcome His enemies in their weakness but in their strength, and it seems to me that the position of Rome is something like that of Jezebel of old. Jezebel painted her face and tied her hair and looked out of a window just before her overthrow; and so I believe it is with Rome in the present day. The blandishments of Rome are still in full force, and she is trying to turn the servants of God from simple trust in Him. It is the Lord God who judgeth her, and who will punish her for her opposition to the Truth. It is by standing up for the Truth of God that we expose the falseness of error.

Apparently, in this last decade of the nineteenth century, there is at least one member of the Anglican Episcopate who believes, and does his best to make his clergy believe, that the Roman Church is Babylon or the Scarlet Lady, and that the Pope is Antichrist or the Man of Sin.

Let us suppose that the Bishop is right. Let us imagine that Rome is Babylon and the Pope is Antichrist.

Probably the last man in England who ought to have drawn public attention to the fact is the one who assumes the title and holds the possessions of the See of Exeter.

First of all, Dr. Bickersteth owes it to "Antichrist" that he is even able to style himself "Bishop of Exeter".

For, were it not for the intervention and authority of that particular impersonation of Antichrist known as St. Leo IX., the Episcopal See had not been founded at Exeter at all.

It was yet in the Anglo-Saxon period, in the reign of

Edward the Confessor, and some sixteen years before the Conquest, that the Church in England first heard of a "Bishop of Exeter".

About the year 1050, Leofric, who was Bishop of Devon and Cornwall, conceived the design of having the Episcopal See transferred from the small town of Crediton to the safer city of Exeter.

In Anglo-Saxon times, when to a bishopric was annexed, not only cure of souls, but territorial privileges and possessions, a seat in the King's Council, and the exercise of a quasi-secular jurisdiction, the erection or transfer of a see was necessarily a something which concerned, not the Pope alone, nor the King alone, but became a matter of concordat, and such as could only be fittingly arranged by the joint action of both powers.

In the Bodleian Library there is kept the ancient manuscript of a Missal, which was given by Bishop Leofric (A.D. 1050) to his Cathedral Church at Exeter. In the fly-leaf of the Missal is still to be read the account of the manner in which the transfer of the see was effected.

As it reflects some light upon the share which Antichrist had in the proceeding, it may be well to give it *verbatim* :—

"Perceiving that both parts of his diocese, namely, Devon and Cornwall, were frequently laid waste by the barbarous incursions of pirates, he (Leofric) began, as we think, by Divine inspiration, to diligently devise by what means he could transfer the Episcopal See from the place called Crediton to the city of Exeter.

"And because he with prudent mind foresaw that this could not be done without the authority of the Roman Church (Babylon!) he sent thither a fitting messenger, one of his priests named Landbert, to the most holy Pope Leo (Antichrist!) and humbly entreated him that he would direct letters from his Fatherhood to King Edward to ask that he would allow the Episcopal See to be changed from the town of Crediton to the city of Exeter, where, free from the attacks of enemies, the ministry of the Church might be more safely directed."

The manner in which Antichrist answered this appeal is recorded as follows :—

“But the Apostolic Pontiff, willingly acceding to his reasonable petition, sent to King Edward the following letter :—

“Leo, Bishop, the Servant of the Servants of God, to Edward, King of the English, most affectionate greeting, with the Apostolic Blessing :—

“If thou art well, and in good health, we give fervent thanks to our Lord Jesus Christ for the same. And this we desire that thou shouldst so successfully hold the reins of government as to enter hereafter into the everlasting dwellings. And because we have heard that thou art zealous and religious in the things which concern God’s Church and Churchmen, we rejoice much thereat, and exhort and lovingly entreat thee that thou shalt so strive to persevere in the works of God, that thou mayst be able to be pleasing to the King of Kings, and to dwell for ever with Him in the Heavenly Kingdom.

“It has come to our knowledge that the Bishop Leofric holds his Episcopal See without a city. We wonder much at the same, not only concerning him, but also concerning all those Bishops who do in like manner. When we shall have sent our Legate to you, we shall speak concerning the others.

“But now, concerning our aforesaid brother Leofric, we command and request (*præcipimus et rogamus*) that by your love for the Lord and for us, you will render him aid, so that he may be able to change his Episcopal Seat from the small town of Crediton to the City of Exeter.

“These and other good works so strive to accomplish, that thou mayst be able to obtain from Christ a Kingdom without end. Farewell, most beloved, ever in the Lord.”

The record adds :—

“The King, with great devotion, assented to these letters, and gave to the aforesaid Bishop the monastery of Holy Mary and of St. Peter the Apostle in the city of Exeter, that he might therein place his Episcopal See.”

Thus the hand of Antichrist was at work in the very laying of the foundations of the See of Exeter.

Nor could Dr. Bickersteth plead that at the date when these events took place, Rome was still pure and primitive, and had not yet become Babylon, nor painted her face and tied up her hair, nor entered on her task of fascinating and corrupting the nations of the earth. For he has only to look within the Missal which this very Leofric used and which he bequeathed to the Church of Exeter, to find that its pages are absolutely filled with the Romish corruptions in their worst and most full-blown form—Sacrifice of the Mass, the Real Presence, Mass for the Dead, Mass for festivals of the Blessed Virgin, and blessings of Eucharistic Vestments, not to speak of several pages of a litany, which bear witness to the practice of the intercession and invocation of the Saints.

Truly, Dr. Bickersteth's see was born during the Babylonian captivity.

The centuries which followed did nothing but draw more closely the bond which from the outset existed between Rome and Exeter.

It was Peter Quivil, Bishop of Exeter, who, dealing with the approbation of relics and recognition of miracles, issued the following decree in his Synod of 1287:—

“In such matters of doubt, recourse must be had to the Most Holy Roman Church (Babylon!) which, by the grace of Almighty God, is proved never to have erred in the authority of Apostolic tradition, and its decision must be awaited lest any one approving what she disapproves should be marked out by Catholics as a heretic.

“And to no one is it lawful to teach or believe other than that which the Roman Church, the Mother of all Churches, shall have been known to observe and to hold.

“But if any shall presume to gainsay this, unless, after warning, they shall renounce their error, we judge them to be severely punished as heretics” (Wilkins' *Concilia*, ii., 155).

Then if Dr. Bickersteth will look inside the registers of his own diocese, he will discover the painfully large share which Antichrist had in the appointment of the pre-Reformation bishops whom he would no doubt claim as his predecessors.

Thus in the registers of Bishop Stafford he will note the entry that he, Edmund Stafford, was "consecrated on the 21st day of June, 1395, by the authority of the underwritten Letters Apostolic". Turning over the pages he will find that the "Letters Apostolic" just mentioned are no less than eight in number, and that one of them is the well-known Oath of Obedience to Antichrist and allegiance to Babylon, which every English bishop of that period took on the day of his consecration.

The Man of Sin had even a hand in securing the actual possessions of the see of Exeter to its incoming bishops. It was only when his Bulls of appointment had arrived that the English Crown would recognise the right of the Bishop-elect to the temporalities.

Thus when Edmund Lacy, Bishop of Hereford, was translated by the Pope to Exeter, King Henry V. wrote to his Chancellor on 8th October, 1420:—

"We will and charge you, that as soon as you be certain that the Bulls of our Holy Father the Pope (*Antichrist!*) be come for the translation of the Bishop of Hereford unto the Church of Exeter, that by our letters to be made under our great seal, ye do make restitution of the temporalities of the said bishopric of Exeter unto the said Bishop without tarrying."

No one will argue for a moment that these historical facts in any sense traverse the contention that the Roman Church is the Babylon of the Apocalypse. That contention stands on its own peculiar merits, and will not be one degree more true or more false because the long line of pre-Reformation Bishops of Exeter is found to dissent from it. But we merely wish to show that the contention, if accepted as true, sheds a strangely lurid light upon the whole history of the English Church, and notably on the history of the See of Exeter.

Between Bishops who look upon the Roman Pontiff as Antichrist, and the Roman Church as Babylon, and Bishops who appeal to the Roman Pontiff as the "Most Holy Pope," and the source of Church authority, as Leofric

did in the eleventh century; who have recourse to "the Most Holy Roman Church," as the unerring guide of Apostolical tradition, as Peter Quivil did in the thirteenth, or who seek consecration at his hands, as Brewer did in the thirteenth, and Grandisson in the fourteenth, or who hailed him as the "Refuge of the Oppressed," as we read in the register of Bishop Oldham in the sixteenth—there exists a relation which is written indelibly into the very fibre of history, and which spells plainly not Continuity but Contrast.

Anglicanism of to-day may agree to pronounce it Continuity. But the voice of men cannot alter the mass of historical facts any more than the winds can lift the mountains.

CHAPTER XLIII.

A Dedication Service at Peterborough.

(18TH JUNE, 1892.)

THE Cathedral of Peterborough was the scene of an important Anglican function.

New furniture and fittings of the richest kind have been provided for the choir, and, on 2nd June, 1892, was held the ceremony of their solemn Dedication.

To quote from *The Guardian*, 8th June, 1892:—

As our readers are probably aware, the ritual choir of Peterborough, which till the recent restoration was entirely comprised in the eastern limb of the building, has now been brought back to the place of the original Benedictine choir, and occupies the first two bays of the nave. When completed the whole will be fitted in the true mediæval fashion, with three rows of stalls on either side, and return stalls at the west end. The upper row of stalls is finished with lofty and very elaborate canopies of almost excessive richness, rising in two tiers of tabernacle work, and ending in tall crocketed spirelets. The upper tier contains niches for statuettes, illustrating the history of the cathedral from the earliest times, nearly the whole of which, as far as the stalls have been completed, are in their places.

The note of ritual which was struck may be gathered from the passage which follows:—

The services of the day began with a celebration of Holy Communion at 8 a.m. The Bishop of Peterborough, Dr. Creighton, was the celebrant, vested in a rich cope of cream-coloured brocaded silk and mitre. The Bishop of Leicester, Bishop Mitchinson, was the Epistoler. The Dedication service was appointed for noon, and attracted a very large congregation, including clergy and representative laity from all parts of the diocese and its adjacent counties; the Mayor and Corporation attended in State with their regalia, as well as the Mayors of Leicester and Stamford. Nearly 200 clergy, with their Rural Deans, headed the procession, followed by the choirs of Peterborough and Lincoln Cathedrals—the Mother Church gladly recognising the call of one of her elder daughters to help her in duly celebrating her day of joy. . . . At the west door the cathedral procession was joined by the Bishop's procession advancing from the Palace. The Bishop was preceded by the diocesan officials and a chaplain bearing his pastoral staff, and followed by his other chaplains. Last of all came the Archbishop of Canterbury, with his chaplains going before him bearing his archiepiscopal cross (erroneously called a "crozier" in the printed order of procession), his Grace being supported by two surpliced King's scholars. . . .

We may add that the sermon at noon was preached by the Bishop of Durham, and that of the evening by the Bishop of Peterborough.

A Bishop celebrant in cope and mitre, an Archbishop in procession preceded by his cross, and the pulpit filled by Bishops morning and evening, are elements which ought to go far to make up a strong and stately function.

Here we behold Anglicanism standing upon holy ground.

In hardly any other spot in England could it have found so much to remind it of the Rock out of which the early English Church was hewn.

Peterborough, as the very name bears witness, is the monument of Catholic England's devotion to the Apostolic See.

It was "Rome in England".

England's piety in Anglo-Saxon and Norman times prompted her princes, her priests and her people in vast numbers to make the pilgrimage to Rome. But it went further, and, thoughtful of the still greater numbers of those who, however wishful, had neither the leisure nor the means for the long and difficult journey, it provided for them substitute shrines at home.

Thus the famous shrine of Our Lady of Walsingham was modelled upon the "Holy House" and became "Loretto in England". In like manner the great Abbey of Medeshamstede—afterwards Peterborough—was believed to have been built by English Kings and privileged by the Popes that it might be to the English people "Rome at home"—a shrine of the Prince of the Apostles in England.

Hence, as Mr. Gunton tells us in his history of Peterborough, it was the recognised English custom that all who visited the Abbey, even were they kings or bishops, or nobles of the highest degree, should take off their shoes at the great gate, and enter barefooted upon the sacred precincts of the church and monastery.

Truly the Anglican function was held upon holy ground!

Quite apart from any question of the authenticity of the charters it recites, the Peterborough sources of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* must be held to be—at the very least—the undoubted witness of the accepted belief and tradition of mediæval England. In giving the account of the foundation of the Abbey, under the year A.D. 675, it says:—

"Now in his (King Ethelred's) time he sent Bishop Wilfrid to Rome, to the Pope that then was—he was called Agatho—and showed him by letter and message how his brothers, Peada and Wulfhere and Sexwulf, the Abbot, had built a minster, which was called Medeshamstede, and that they had freed it against King and against Bishop of all services; and he besought him that he would assent to it with his rescript and his blessing. And then the Pope sent his rescript to England, thus saying," etc.

In the rescript which the *Chronicle* cites thereon the Pope confirms the privileges and liberties of the monastery, and adds:—

"I will and concede that whatever man shall have made a vow to go to Rome, which he may be unable to fulfil either from sickness, or the Lord's need (of him), or from poverty, or be he unable to come there from any other kind of need, be he of England or of whatever other island he be,

let him come to Medeshamstede, and have the same forgiveness of Christ and St. Peter, and of the Abbot and the monks, that he should have if he went to Rome."

The same idea is still more clearly set forth in the account which the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* gives of the consecration of the Abbey by the Archbishop Deusdedit and other prelates, under the year A.D. 657:—

"At the hallowing of the Monastery King Wulfhere was present, and his brother Ethelred and his sisters, Kyneburg and Kineswyth. . . . When the Monastery had been hallowed in the name of St. Peter, St. Paul, St. Andrew, then the King stood up before all his thanes and said with a clear voice: 'Thanked be the high Almighty God for the worthy deed which here is done, and I will this day do honour to Christ and St. Peter'."

(The King then recites the gift of the "lands and waters and meres, and fens, and weirs" which he bestows on the Monastery.)

The Chronicle continues:—

"Then said the King: 'This gift is little, but it is my will that they shall hold it so royally and so freely that neither geld nor tribute be taken from it, except for the monks alone. And thus free I will make this minster, that it be subject to Rome alone (*Romae soli subiiciatur*), and here it is my will that all of us who are unable to go to Rome shall visit St. Peter.'"

The passage which follows recounts the usual petition for Roman authorisation: "When these things were done the King sent to Rome to Vitalian, who was then Pope, and desired that he should grant by his rescript, and with his blessing, all the before-mentioned things".

These words, at the very least, represent to us what Peterborough was and claimed to be to the mediæval Catholic.

In the tenth century the Monastery which had been destroyed by the Danes was restored by King Edgar, at the instance of St. Ethelwold, Bishop of Winchester, and its name gradually changed into Peterborough. The Bishop

laid before the King fragments of the ancient charter and privileges which had been hidden in the walls, and King Edgar, says Mr. Gunton, "finding he had a second Rome within his own Kingdom, wept for joy".

If it be urged that these charters are spurious, it must also be remembered that the forgers themselves could not have lived later than the twelfth century, and that they were bound by the very conditions of success to forge upon the lines of pre-existing beliefs.

The Anglican ceremony of the 2nd inst. took place upon the sacred ground which the tradition of the Early English Church had consecrated as the memorial of Rome within this realm.

Those who have rejected and renounced Rome stood in the place built and hallowed by those who loved and obeyed her.

To measure the sadness of the contrast we have only to think what might have been, and picture the ceremony as it would have been if carried out by the Catholic Church in the midst of a Catholic people.

Upon a throne in this St. Peter's Church in England would have sat an Archbishop, holding his commission from the successor of St. Peter, the Shepherd of the whole flock, and wearing the Pallium "from the body of St. Peter," which St. Gregory gave to Augustine. His very person would have set forth the living unity of the Church, being as truly and closely in communion with the Roman Pontiff as Deusdedit and Theodore were with Agatho and Vitalian.

The nave would have been filled with a people whom all Catholic Christendom would have recognised as brethren and fellow Catholics, and whose hearts would go as loyally Romeward as those of the great Anglo-Saxon family Peada, Wulfhere, Ethelred, Kynesburgh, and Kineswyth, who laid the foundations of Peterborough.

The chancel would have been filled with priests consecrated to God, and vowed to their vocation by the same sanction as those which ministered here under Theodore. Around the phalanx of the secular clergy would have been

seen the uniforms of the regular orders showing forth in their variety that wonderful equipment of multiform wings of service which makes the Church "like to an army set in array". The Benedictine, the Dominican, the Cistercian, the Franciscan, the Norbertine, would each have taken his place there as a true successor of his brethren of former days of Peterborough, of Lincoln, of Pipewell, of Northampton, or of Barlings.

Over the place of that silver-plated High Altar where Wolsey sang Mass and "bare his palm," and near the Lady Chapel where he washed and kissed the feet of fifty-nine poor men, in the Holy Week during his last sad journey to the North, would have been offered the Adorable Sacrifice, and the walls of the old Abbey would have heard the same sacred words of the Canon in the same tongue even as they heard it at the first Mass of their hallowing.

And bishops, priests and people would all have tasted throughout of that deep and peaceful joy (so easy to feel but so hard to describe) which makes the heaven-upon-earth of a Catholic ceremony—the blessedness of beholding a presentment of the Catholic Church in her beauty and majesty as the Spouse of Christ—the consciousness that we are made partakers in a worship, a ministry and a liturgy which transcend the limits of people and nationhood and make us feel our oneness with the Church throughout the world and the Church throughout the centuries, and mingle our voices with the Hosannas of the Church above, where time and distance are merged in the eternal.

In such a ceremony, and inside the ancient walls of Peterborough, the Catholic Church would have been supremely at home.

The place was made for her, and she would have fitted, as she alone can, into its architecture and into its history.

In the Anglican function, while we rejoice in witnessing the revival of reverent love of God's House which prompted it, who can fail to note the points of discord?

In the sanctuary of the Church of St. Peter, built in loving allegiance to Rome—that it might be our "Rome in England"—bishops and clergy who hold their positions by a

denial of Rome's jurisdiction—their very *raison d'être* a negative to the process by which the Abbey was founded. In the choir, and in the stalls of Peterborough—of “Peterborough of the monks”!—neither monks nor monastic orders visible! In the chancel a liturgy which the early English Church never heard, framed avowedly to be the setting of Reformation doctrines the mere mention of which would have made the ancient owners of Peterborough stop their ears and cry anathema!

These contrasts were much too salient to escape altogether the attention of those who took part in the ceremony, and the preachers, both at the noonday and the evening service, offered each at least *obiter* a word of explanation.

Dr. Westcott's theory is that the Church in the days when Peterborough was monastic and now in the days when it is Anglican, teaches after all, not different truths, but different sides of the same truth. When the stalls of the Abbey were filled by members of the mighty Benedictine brotherhood, and when the Church here in England was but a province of one world-wide whole, then—she was teaching the grandeur of corporate life. But in the changes introduced by the Reformation, she has taught the personal responsibilities of the individual conscience.

Such at least we take to be the meaning of the passage:—

It (the National Church) has reaped and garnered the harvests of every age, and kept them without preference for use in due season. It has shown us the strength and the grandeur of corporate life in the middle ages; it has shown us the awful prerogatives of the single soul in the individualism of the Reformation; and now it is striving through all perplexities and divisions towards a fuller truth, towards the apprehension of the highest unity in which the indestructible fact of personal responsibility shall be combined with the adoring recognition of one life in Him in Whom all things are reconciled and summed up.

That, in plain English, would read to a Catholic as a plea that before the Reformation England shared in the strength and grandeur of Church unity; but that since the Reformation she has committed herself to the system of Protestant individualism and private judgment; and that Anglicanism

is now engaged in the hopelessly insoluble task of getting back the one without giving up the other.

To us, the Church of Christ teaches "all truth"—whether the claim of authority which is the very basis of corporate life, or the prerogative of conscience in the individual soul, which underlies all recognition of authority—and is found to teach them harmoniously and simultaneously. Nor can we even conceive the Church as mincing her task and devoting some fifteen centuries to the demonstration of the one, and then three centuries to the inculcation of the other.

The explanation of the entire absence of the monastic element in a Church where the very soil and walls were for centuries saturated with monasticism, was lightly touched upon by the evening preacher, the Bishop of Peterborough.

He would have them look at that great building, Peterborough's imperishable record of the great thoughts of those men who made England in the past. Think of the pathos of the building that told them their local history; how it brought home what their forefathers did. Other men had laboured, and we entered into their labours. Let them carry their minds back to the little band of monks who first took possession of this district—not, as now, so smiling and cultivated, but barren and horribly wild, on the extreme shore of the fen land, looking over a waste of water. There, on rising ground, bands of half-clothed savages strove to earn a scanty livelihood by fishing and fowling. Such was this district when the pioneers of Christian civilisation took up their abode in it. They did their work as missionaries; they did their work and brought men to a knowledge of the truth; they made possible the beginnings of a civilised life. They were pioneers, too, of industry as well as of truth. At a time when other men only dared to build wooden houses, they built mighty buildings in stone, their rights of asylum being recognised by those whose life was given to warfare and bloodshed. They told of peace, they told of order; they were representatives of humanitarian efforts. It was at that time monasteries greatly flourished. Men had nothing else to look to for peace. Therefore they gave liberally, these rude warriors, these rude men of the feudal days; it was the only way they could benefit their own time and the times that were to come. But that time passed away, not so much through the fault of the monks as through the fact that society overtook them; the monks were living, after all, an impossible life; they were perpetuating distinctions which it was desirable should not continue. As times grew more and more settled, and knowledge more universal, it was found to be

possible to live in the world a life with God, and monks and monasteries disappeared before the advent of the new England, disappeared only because the need of them disappeared.

It would be passing strange that monasticism, which even non-Catholic historians acknowledge to have been the prime and most powerful agency in establishing and in shaping the Christianity of Europe for centuries, should have been an "impossible life". It was clearly not impossible for St. Basil or St. Jerome, or for St. Patrick, St. Columba, St. Augustine or St. Aidan, for Theodore or St. Dunstan, or St. Anselm. What can the Bishop of Peterborough find in the temperature of the times which would render it less possible for modern monks to be poor, chaste and obedient even as they were? Surely the promise of Christ to those who leave lands and wife and children for His sake is not evacuated by the conditions and progress of human society!

A still more strange reading of Church history would it be to imply that the important discovery of being able "to live in the world a life with God" was reserved for these later times!

A Catholic would find it hard to decide whether the explanation of the morning or that of the evening was the less satisfactory.

The leaders of Anglicanism are well advised in their desire to revive the solemnity of ecclesiastical functions.

A solemn function, well carried out, has much the same elevating effect upon public opinion that the rendering of a sublime musical composition has upon an appreciative audience.

But an important point must be kept in view.

The chiefest charm of all such ceremonial—and especially of that which is carried out under the roof of a venerable abbey-church or cathedral—lies not merely in the melody of the actual worship and movement, but in the harmony which both will strike with the setting of historical, local, and liturgical associations.

Anglicanism, both by its *personnel* and its doctrinal position, seems to us debarred from this primary condition of success.

Its ministry and attitude are anti-Roman, while the whole volume of its historical antecedents is indelibly Roman.

Into cathedrals which cry out by their very construction that they were framed for our liturgy, for our doctrines and for our ceremonial, it seeks to fit in a service, doctrines and ceremonies which are plainly the outcome and work of the Reformation.

Its melody is in one key, and the historic, doctrinal and architectural accompaniment is hopelessly set in another. The oftener, by such functions as those at Peterborough, the rendering of the theme is thus attempted, the more plain and painful to discerning ears will be the jarring of the discord.

We can but yearn and pray all the more for the day when the worship of England will be once more attuned to the concert of Catholic Christendom and to the rich harmony of the sacred traditions of its history.

CHAPTER XLIV.

The Lambeth Judgment and the Privy Council.

(10TH SEPTEMBER, 1892.)

THE expected has happened, and the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council has confirmed the Lambeth Judgment.

The highest tribunal in the Anglican Church has spoken, and the highest Court in the State has—somewhat tardily, but all the more deliberately—ratified its verdict.

In future, an Anglican clergyman may consecrate and administer wine mixed with water.

He may have candles—lighted candles—above the Communion table while he does so.

He may have the *Agnus Dei* sung between the Consecration and Communion.

He may celebrate with his face turned to the east, which—apart from any process of contortion—means with his back to the people.

He may, moreover, take the ablutions—or what Lord Grimthorpe impatiently termed “the rinsings”—publicly and during the service.

And in doing all this, he can feel that he is now absolutely secure from let or hindrance by the unbelieving or evilly-disposed, and that he has for this significant fivefold practice the authorisation of the highest legal tribunal in England.

The import of the decision is obvious.

All minds, in direct proportion to their endowment of common-sense, very readily realise the force of what is called the cumulative or conjunctive quality of evidence—the suggestive precision with which the links in a chain of evidence fit one into the other with a click and clasp of mutual recognition.

A gentleman discharges his servants. He secures the services of a caretaker for his house. He orders his carriage for a given hour. He takes a train to the coast. He charts a residence abroad. The facts are five. It is not that any one of them has very much point, but that they all point the same way. *Possibly* he discharged his servants because he disliked them. *Possibly* he employed the caretaker to have on hand as a supernumerary. *Possibly* his carriage was ordered merely for a daily drive. *Possibly* he went to spend a day at the sea-side. *Possibly* the residence abroad was taken for a friend. Any or all of the five facts taken by themselves might easily be explained away, but not nearly so easily what may be called the sixth fact—the significant fact of the five facts coming all together. The multiplied plea of possibilities would be utterly lost on the judgment of hard common-sense, and the average British jury, to whom such facts would be submitted, would not be found to waste any appreciable portion of its valuable time in coming to the conclusion that the gentleman in question had simply taken steps to quit the country.

Possibly lighted candles do not always symbolise sacrifice or local presence of something to be worshipped, although such lights have been traditionally associated *eminenter* with the Sacrifice of the Mass.

Possibly the mixture of the chalice with water may mean nothing more than the maintenance of an ancient eucharistic practice, although liturgically it implies that the elements

are constructively prepared to be the Victim in whom the weakness of our humanity was ineffably united to the strength of the Divinity, and from whose sacred side flowed forth the saving tide of water and blood on Calvary.

Possibly the *Agnus Dei* may mean nothing more than a hymn addressed to Christ reigning in heaven, and the fact that it is sung at the particular moment between the Consecration and Communion is due, say, to a liturgical coincidence—and not to the earnest faith which lovingly hails the presence of the Lamb, “as if slain upon the altar,” in that unceasing propitiatory sacrifice in which He is forever “taking away the sins of the world”.

Possibly the altar-ward, instead of the people-ward, attitude of the celebrant may be simply a matter of taste, or predilection, or convenience, and not an indication that the celebrant is engaged in the work of a vicarious and sacrificial priesthood, with his face turned, not to the multitude, but to God, as he goes up the holy mountain to plead the irresistible mercy-cry of Calvary upon their behalf.

Possibly, too, the reverent care which consumes at the altar the remains of the sacrifice with minute and loving solicitude as to the least drop or particle, may be due to a mere habit of exactitude in holy things, and not to the doctrinal conviction that the bread and wine by consecration have become in their veriest substance, and in every discernible part thereof, the precious Body and saving Blood of the Redeemer.

Possibly, as the Archbishop himself has said, these things “have no doctrinal significance”.

Who will care to waste words in discussing the possibilities?

But the facts are five, and, like finger-posts, they point to a single conclusion—one much too plain for the great jury of British public opinion to mistake or misinterpret it.

After three centuries of protest and denial, the Anglican Church has come to formally open the way for the admission of the doctrines of the Real Presence and the Sacrifice of the Mass, and to allow them to be set forth with something of the eloquence of symbolism and the constancy of liturgy,

while the highest civil authority in the land stamps this acceptance with the seal of English law, and humbly advises the Crown to dismiss the appeal of those who clamour against such beliefs and practices as alien to the teaching and liturgy of the Church of England.

Truly our ruined altars are reaping one of the revenges of history.

The higher Anglican movement has thus achieved an important, albeit a domestic, victory. It has shaken itself free of those tiresome troublers within its own household which were wont to impede its progress. Where hitherto it has walked by sufferance, it can now walk by sanction.

Not indeed that Anglicanism would care to erect a victory upon a pedestal so narrow or lowly as the verdict of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. It may be trusted to feel that it has its own strength, and not the good-will of the lawyers, to thank for its success. Altogether apart from the hollowness of its claims, it belongs to the class of movements which are mental and vital, and decisions of law courts can do but very little at the best either to make or to mar it.

It is not the flag of the besieger that captures the citadel, although planted there; it serves to announce the capture. The judgment just given does not make the Anglican success. But it serves to register the successful issue of a siege which has been steadily laid for the last half century to the religious public opinion of the establishment, and it signals a victory which could never have been won but by deep earnestness and unwearied perseverance, devotedly displayed in the face of difficulties through many years, and at many points of its surface.

And yet Anglicans not less than ourselves, would be the first to admit, while giving credit where credit is due, that the triumph is not one of men, but assuredly of doctrines.

To Catholics who look upon this battlefield from the vantage ground of the true Church, the sight is profoundly inspiring and consoling. We are happily inured to the sweet sense of the irresistible strength of Catholic truth as felt within the fold. But it is a joy to behold the marvellous

power which Catholic conceptions exert, even when projected into the region of minds which lies outside the pale. They win, as it were, of their own inherent virtue, like swords that carry victory in their stroke even in the hands of those whose own they are not, and who never received the warrant to wield them.

Our estimate of the importance of the victory Anglicanism has won will not be diminished if we seek to analyse the real grounds upon which it has been given to it.

It speaks volumes for the sincerity, not to say the simplicity, of the appellants that they should have carried their case to the Judicial Committee in the *naïf* belief that that tribunal would condemn the practices complained of, if it found them to conflict with such legal standards of the Church of England as the Articles or Prayer-book.

Such an expectation is based on an utter misapprehension of the function of a supreme tribunal. Courts of First Instance may very properly content themselves with seeing that an institution moves and works upon the lines that are traced upon the face of its trust-deeds. But a supreme tribunal may well feel that its responsibility goes farther and wider and requires it to take cognisance of the higher duty of safeguarding the institution for the main motives for which it was created, even though the terms of its trust-deeds, or what might be called the bye-laws of its working, should, owing to altered circumstances, have to be strained, or construed in a non-natural sense for the purpose.

For it may be considered a sounder and a higher law that an institution should continue to do the work which it was intended to do, than that it should do that work in the particular groove, or according to the particular methods, which its originators, in the wisdom of their time, had prescribed for it.

The duty of the Judicial Committee, as practically the Supreme Temporal Court, is to preserve and carry out the Reformation settlement. Undoubtedly that settlement enjoins the observance of such regulations of belief and worship as are laid down in the Articles and the Prayer-book. But the settlement itself was not merely *doctrinaire*, and

had a broader and deeper and more statesmanlike object, and one which—as a temporal court would most readily recognise—was undoubtedly national or political as well as theological. That object was that the majority of Englishmen should be folded for the work of public worship into a uniform national corporation, independent of foreign control, and bearing the name of the Church of England, and that the states and endowments of the Church in this realm should be maintained to it for that purpose.

The end in view was plainly emancipation from foreign jurisdiction, and the establishment of a working system of religious corporate uniformity, covering effectively and *en gros* the masses of the English people. Hence it came that the first step, from the point of view of the settlers, was necessarily to strike the doctrinal average upon which such uniformity was practically attainable, and the very reason why such standards as the Articles and Prayer-book were framed and accepted at all, was that they, in point of fact, did represent, more or less fairly, the desired average based and calculated upon the various existing theological forces which effected the English Reformation.

The calculation may be taken as correct for the time, but unless by a miracle religious parties remained stereotyped in their actual dimensions, it could not be correct for ever.

To hold that the perpetual permanence of the average thus ascertained should be rigidly guaranteed and enforced as a quasi-sacred figure, even when the religious elements which were its creating factors have long since changed in weight and denomination, would not be love of law, but the fetish-worship of a statute—not the fulfilment, but the thwarting of the Reformation policy.

It may not be quite fair to compare it to the action of one who would insist on the application of a statute which regulated the food-prices under the Tudors to a nineteenth-century market, but at least we may regard it as investing the originators of the settlement with a power over the conscience of their posterity, which they certainly could not possess, and to which, to do them justice, even they can hardly have had the temerity to lay claim.

Then above and behind all such standard-making lies that main and primary object of the settlement which it is assumed to be the duty of every Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, past, present and future, to keep steadily in view—the preservation of Church status and endowments for the national religious corporation which includes broadly the bulk or at least a majority of the English population.

It follows that if a small or unimportant section of the Anglican Church should commit itself to beliefs or practices inconsistent with the obvious meaning of the standards, it is plainly the office of the Temporal Court to order it into uniformity, for the settlement does not intend that the State should endow the religious vagaries of the few to the offence or irritation of the many. But if that section should become numerically strong and influential the conditions of judgment would be materially changed, and it would be just as plainly the duty of the Temporal Court to see that it was not cut off, against its will, from its place and share in the national establishment. For manifestly the settlement which intends antecedently that the endowments shall be used for religious worship of the whole, or technically the whole, is bound to see that no important or considerable part shall be driven out or disinherited. Such an amputation would defeat the very *raison d'être* of the settlement itself, and no standards, however clear or precise, originally laid down to guide the working of an institution, can be in equity interpreted against the major conditions for which the institution itself was called into existence.

A supreme court which rises to the height of its office would be certain to keep such a proportion well in mind and to act accordingly.

No doubt, evidence would be discussed, and standards and trust-deeds scrutinised with lawyer-like patience and acumen, but, very properly, the eyes of the tribunal would never for a moment be withdrawn from the primary purpose of the settlement it administers, and if the respondents cover a body so large and important that their excision would baulk that purpose, the decision in whatever way it might be couched is bound not to be given—certainly not to be enforced—against them.

If the offenders will not keep within the standards, the standards must be enlarged to include the offenders. New justificatory matter may have to be discovered, and new interpretations adopted, but the issue is fixed *ab initio* by the numerical status and influence of the religious party, and in the result Her Majesty will be "humbly advised to dismiss the appeal" of those who seek to repress it.

Hence we take it that the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council is perfectly consistent if it now says No where many years ago it said Yes. The prohibition which it launched, in all faithfulness to its trust, against a small and insignificant handful of Ritualists, could not without unfaithfulness to the same trust be applied to a body which has become the most powerful and popular party in the establishment.

Lord Grimthorpe may naturally cry out, as Sir Fitzroy Kelly did in the days of the Ridsdale decision, that the judgment is one "not of law but of policy".

Quite true, but what if it is?

The change might have been worded differently, and we should have said that the judgment is one of higher law as distinguished from mere letter-law, for law in its highest form requires that a State tribunal shall preserve an institution for the primary purpose of its settlement. But what is that purpose, in last analysis, but to carry out the "policy" which entered into the very creation of the settlement—the policy of the adaptation and interpretation of the standards of the English Church so as to include and not exclude the various religious parties of which the establishment is composed.

Both the verdict of the Lambeth Judgment and that of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council were fore-written several years ago in the growing statistics of the English Church Union.

CHAPTER XLV.

The Lambeth Judgment as an Eirenicon.

(24TH SEPTEMBER, 1892.)

WHERE shall we seek for authoritative pronouncements on matters of actual controversy within the Anglican Com-

munion? We see how such pronouncements operate upon the Anglican mind. There are plentiful decisions by the Crown, acting on the advice of the Privy Council. But Anglicans of the higher kind do not accept such judgments as the voice of the Spiritual authority of their Church.

In one case, at least, the spiritual head of the Anglican Church in this country delivered a judgment dealing exhaustively and authoritatively with the leading points of difference which separate the contending parties in the bosom of Anglicanism.

This, at least, is remarkable, as the nearest approach to a spiritual judgment on matters of controversy which has been made since the Reformation. As such, it forms a convenient test to enable us to see how far it may be practicable to effect a pacification of the ritual war in England.

“The Lambeth Judgment makes for peace.”

So say many of those for whom it was intended.

We are not convinced that it will. But we are convinced that they who say that it will, must have a conception of religious peace entirely different from our own.

We may take it for granted that a peace if it be not true must be false; if it be not real must be illusory; if it be not genuine must be a sham—and falsities, illusions and shams in religion are a shade more mischievous and unlovely than any which are found in the ways of the world and the experiences of social life.

A and B are two persons. Each has his own personal views about religion, and each differs considerably from the other.

But a revealed Truth—let us call it T—is proposed to both by an authority which both recognise as Divine. Each submits his intelligence to the revealing authority. Each puts aside his personal views in homage to the Divine Teacher, and receives and believes T with complete and conscientious assent.

T, one and the same, existing in the minds of A and B makes them so far mentally one with each other. Existing also in the mind of the Revealer, it makes both not only one with each other, but one with Him. They, in a way, are co-partakers of the Divine mind.

Such a unity—unity in the self-same Truth received and believed—is not merely verbal, extrinsic or notional. It is real, substantial, vital and penetrating to the inmost conscience of the factors united.

It is unity—thorough and in truth—as we understand it in the Catholic Church, and such as we take to be described in the “one mind and one heart.” of the Acts of the Apostles.

Its price is the rendering of that first and highest act of service which man owes his Maker—the bending of his intellect to the voice and authority of God as a Teacher. “And they shall be taught of God.”

Its effect is religious peace, peace which is blessed and stable—“such as the world cannot give”—because it is the mutual sharing in the Mind of Christ.

An object-lesson of such unity, and the peace which results from it, might be graphically set forth at any time by assembling in the same room a dozen recognised Catholics—one from London, one from Paris, one from Vienna, one from Madrid, one from Rome, one from Melbourne, one from Montreal, one from New York, one from Calcutta, one from Algiers, one from Rio and one from Yokohama.

The statement of any Article of Catholic faith would find this representative group absolutely at one.

Neither in such doctrines as the Real Presence, nor in the Immaculate Conception, nor in Papal Infallibility more than in the Consubstantiality of the Son, would they find matter for difference or discussion.

They would find ample play for their intelligence and zeal in considering how these doctrines could best be defended or expounded to the world. But to them the truth of the doctrines themselves would be no more a matter of question than the existence of God or the accuracy of the multiplication table. For them, all that has been settled by Christ saying it. “He that heareth you, heareth Me.”

Is this the kind of “peace” which is likely to be produced by the Lambeth Judgment? Clearly not.

For religious peace, as we understand it, is the outcome of two plain conditions.

First, conscientious submission to a divinely commissioned authoritative teacher.

Secondly, oneness of mind and belief in the truths taught.

Both are conspicuously absent from the Lambeth Judgment.

No one—not even the section of Anglicanism which has most to gain by it—recognises the Judgment as authoritative.¹ While, as to the minds of the contending parties, they are no more in agreement after the Judgment than they were before it.

What conceivable impact has the Judgment made upon the convictions of men like Dr. Ryle, Bishop of Liverpool, or Lord Grimthorpe, or the masses that follow them? It is difficult to measure the inappreciably small, but it is probably about the same which the protest of the Bishop of Liverpool and the letter of Lord Grimthorpe have made upon the conscience of the English Church Union!

The “peace,” then, does not mean that henceforth there shall be any greater degree of mental unity than heretofore.

It does not mean that either of the parties has surrendered for a moment any one of the antipathies and opposing beliefs by which one loves what the other detests, and one teaches what the other denies, and one is zealous to promote what the other is equally zealous to denounce and condemn.

The Lambeth Judgment has done as much to pacify this internecine war as a breath of wind passing over the battlefield would do to arrest the conflict.

All that we can extract out of the promise that it “will make for peace,” is that this doctrinal war will not for the future be waged in the arena of the law courts. In the court of the individual conscience and in the court of the collective conscience, called public opinion, it will go on as fiercely and relentlessly as before.

As Dr. Bell, an Anglican clergyman, very well expresses it:—

. . . I cannot imagine how the Judgment makes for peace. When in common life two parties quarrel and through the action of a friend are reconciled, they confess their sorrow for the past, shake

¹ *The Church Times* said: “We feel it a duty to maintain that the judgment is of no spiritual validity”.

hands and resolve to put away the causes of offence from which the quarrel sprang. There is now peace between them, and they are in all points at one. Has this any parallel in the present case? Will High Churchmen now confess they were wrong in disturbing the peace of the Church for the sake of introducing ceremonial pronounced by both Courts to have no doctrinal significance? Will they abandon ritual so meaningless, or even acknowledge that it has no doctrinal import whatever? Will Evangelical men acknowledge that they have been mistaken in objecting to ceremonial borrowed from the Roman Church and used because of its doctrinal significance? Will they look upon it with any greater favour than before and perhaps adopt it since it has been declared not to be illegal? I cannot think so, and I believe they will avoid, as before, churches where such unmeaning and objectionable ritual is practised. Instead of bringing High Churchmen and Evangelical Churchmen nearer to one another, I believe it will accentuate their differences.

If there be but two kinds of peace—the true and the false, the real and the artificial—it is not difficult to decide to which kind belongs the peace which is likely to be effected by the Lambeth Judgment.

But we speak as outsiders, and even when the examination of issues which are all-important for our own instruction press upon us the ungracious task of alluding to the discord which obtains in the Anglican household, we may not forget that our very standpoint may lead us, even unconsciously, into laying undue stress upon divisions which contrast so strongly with the unanimity of belief and worship to which we, as Catholics, are naturally accustomed.

Hence, the exposition of what is meant by the “peace” aimed at by the Lambeth Judgment, and how far it falls short of the reality and vitality of the *Pax Catholica*, may well be left to be sufficiently set forth by Anglican writers themselves.

We may present these utterances as they are given to us with what we may term three degrees of frankness.

First, there is a statement of the case by *The Guardian*. It reads to us like an attempt to conceal a chasm by raising a cloud of dust upon the brink.

The recognition of the hymn (the *Agnus Dei*) need not, and, as we contend, ought not to have any doctrinal significance. Those who believe in a special Presence in the Sacrament will no doubt think the hymn specially appropriate; to those who have no such

belief, the words are still suitable and may be employed as harmlessly in the Communion Service as in the middle of the Litany. It is only those who are determined to find a doctrinal significance in the use of the hymn at a particular part of the service who will be gratified or aggrieved. The significance is the result of their own arbitrary determination. Similarly, we must say that in our own judgment far too much has been made of the "sacrificial" import of the eastward position. The position may be convenient and we can go so far as to say that it is appropriate; but that it need have any doctrinal import whatever in connection with *sacrifice* we cannot persuade ourselves. Wider experience of Protestant and Catholic ceremonies makes it impossible to identify particular ceremonies with particular doctrines. And we have always thought that there never was a more mistaken statement than that a chasuble was *sacrificial*, while a cope was not. Nobody unacquainted with the fancies of arbitrary symbolists could possibly associate the special doctrine with the special dress. We trust that none, on either side, will try to read meanings into things, words and positions that they do not necessarily bear. Of course, we are prepared to allow that the outward ceremonial is preferred by those who hold particular doctrine. All we contend is, that the connection is *unessential*. At any rate, it is the worst of policy to *insist* on the significance of ceremonies that have of themselves no doctrinal importance whatever. So far, things may very well remain as they are. We should be sorry if Low Churchmen take offence where none need be taken.

Could politic pleading farther go?

Here we have a temper of mind and a tone of speech which Catholics certainly do not find it easy to understand.

The sun in the heavens at noonday is not more plain than the fact that the very reason why the Anglican revival has adopted the practices referred to, and the very reason why Low Churchmen have objected to them, is precisely because these practices *are* symbolical of certain doctrines. Were it not for the fact of this doctrinal significance, every one knows that there would never have been a Lambeth Judgment at all.

Is it conceivable that the writer alone in all England was not aware of this fact when he penned the above given lines? Could he even imagine it to be possible that the High Church movement and the Low Church movement should each suddenly arrest its course and resolve for the future to abandon its habit of regarding given practices as the symbols of given beliefs?

.

Surely it is altogether unworthy to plead that the connection between ceremony and doctrine is not *essential*. The connection between the symbol and the thing symbolised never could be. Not even the letters of the alphabet need denote the corresponding sounds unless we make them. It is not a question whether the connection is "essential" or not, but whether it exists as a public and recognised fact. That it does, all the world is witness.

A second statement, many degrees more frank, is found in *The Church Times*.

It will be remembered that when the Archbishop of Canterbury made a disclaimer, similar to that just quoted, as to the connection between liturgical practices and the doctrines they symbolise, it earned for his judgment that criticism of "unreality" of which *The Times* spoke in terms of ill-concealed contempt. *The Church Times* says:—

We are in perfect agreement with *The Times* in a criticism which touches the Archbishop as much as the Committee, to the effect that "there is a sense of unreality in the effort to treat as neutral or colourless acts which are known to be, in the view of a party in the Church, technical symbols and unequivocal signs". The Archbishop certainly gained no increase of respect for his judgment by his attempt to show that Catholic ritual is not to be taken as an outward expression of Catholic doctrine.

We may take it on the evidence of those most concerned—even if we doubted our own convictions—that the differences which mar the peace of the Anglican Communion are not merely those of ritual, but those of doctrine.

The third statement tells us, in the superlative degree of frankness and honesty, how deep is the cleavage of these doctrinal divisions, and how utterly childish and futile is any attempt to disguise their true import.

It is an Anglican bishop, Dr. Alford, who writes thus to *The Guardian*. (The italics are ours.)

The Times recommends a "truce" between the two contending parties in our Church on the presence of Christ on the "altar". The true nature of the controversy is withheld from view, and incidental points instead of the central question as above stated made the ground of argumentation. *The Real Presence in the Sacrament*,

whether by transubstantiation or in some other unimaginable mode, was the question of the Reformation period, and it is the question of the present day. The question does not admit of compromise. As reasonably might a Romanist and a Protestant be expected to communicate at the same table and in the same form of worship, as a conscientious member of the Reformed Church of England and the modern ritualist as represented by the English Church Union!

The question is in everybody's mind, if not on everybody's lip—"What next? What is to be the end of it?"

In a second letter, the Bishop puts the case still more forcibly.

One may even doubt if any Catholic writer has ventured to depict the Anglican differences with anything like the same degree of clearness and plainness of speech that we find in the following passage.

Speaking of the section of Anglicans who assume the name of "Catholic," Bishop Alford says:—

Let us consider the "Catholic" and contrast him with his fellow-worshipper of the Reformation type at the holy table.

1. The one regards the consecrated elements as the real objective presence of the Lord; the other as bread and wine which the Lord has commanded to be received.

2. The one worships Christ "present" in the consecrated elements on the table as he cries, "O Lamb of God," etc.; the other adores his Saviour at the right hand of God in heaven.

3. The one regards himself as participator in a propitiatory sacrifice; the other as a guest at a spiritual feast.

4. The one is "communicated"! As I heard 1 Corinthians x. 16 emphatically expounded a few Sundays ago in a country church:—

"The cup of blessing which we bless is it not the communion, or *communication!* of the Blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not the communion, or *communication!* of the Body of Christ?"

The other in the exercise of a lively faith holds spiritual communion or fellowship with Christ and His Church.

5. The one sees on the "altar-cross" a sympathetic victim Lamb! the other looks back to Calvary and beholds the Lamb of God, the crucified Saviour slain once for all, a full, perfect and sufficient sacrifice for sin.

6. The one, like the Magi who worshipped the infant Redeemer as He lay in the crib at Bethlehem, worships Christ upon the altar, a representation of the propitiatory sacrifice, a substitution of Mass for Communion; the other offers himself a living sacrifice to God.

My inquiry is, What kind of communion or fellowship can there be between these two worshippers at the Lord's Table? They are not agreed on first principles. *They differ, wide as the poles, on the funda-*

mental articles of the Christian faith. The one holds the sacrament of the Lord's Supper to be one thing, the other a contrary! Sincere these communicants may be in their respective confessions of faith, but when you analyse them, instead of communion disunion is everywhere apparent! There is no room here for a "truce". "Compromise" there can be none. The terms are inapplicable to the case. To the "Protestant Churchman" ritualism is a delusion, a self-deception, an antagonism! To the "Catholic," in the words of Lord Halifax, the Communion office of the Church of England—

"However excellent in itself, if taken alone is absolutely insufficient as an expression of the worship due from man to God, and which cannot and does not supply the wants and instincts of man's heart"—(*Times* report of annual meeting of English Church Union, 16th June, 1892).

Communion on such opposite religious theories must be unreal, unreasonable in sight of man, unacceptable in the sight of God.

The concluding passage is perhaps the best answer that could be given to the plea we have quoted from *The Guardian* :—

To give encouragement to or opportunity (as in the use of the *Agnus Dei*) for words of devotion addressed by some to Christ in heaven! by others allowedly to Christ on the altar! and all to cover a false show of "communion" among communicants is, to my mind, very shocking and even worse! It is inconsistent with candour, singlemindedness, and honesty of purpose to cloak under a form of devotion diversity of religious profession. But the "Judgment" seems to me to suggest this in order that those who love and those who hate the principles of the Reformation may meet together at the same table, and *disruption be avoided!* I believe such a practice to be demoralising in the sight of man and dangerously offensive in the sight of God.

God teaches the nations through their own experiences.

It is by such evidences written thus deeply in its own national life that Divine Providence would bring home to the conscience of this country the great lesson that religious peace is unattainable as long as the sole peace-producing principle—obedience to an Authoritative Church—is rejected.

When its prophets shall have wearied of striving to "heal the breach of the daughter of His People by crying 'Peace, peace,' where there is no peace," we may hope that England will return to the fold where her "people shall sit in the beauty of peace and the tabernacles of confidence and the wealth of rest".

CHAPTER XLVI.

Rome and the Statute of Provisors.

(OCTOBER AND NOVEMBER, 1892.)

ARCHBISHOP BENSON delivered the opening address at the Church Congress of 1892.

In doing so, he incidentally laid his finger upon one of the most interesting pages of our English Church history.

Amid the troubles which press upon the Anglican Church, in the hour of its trial, the Archbishop drew comfort from the thought that the outlook at present was not more threatening than that which darkened the path of the Catholic Church at certain periods of her history before the Reformation.

He asked :—

To what age would we transport ourselves to obtain more favourable conditions? Shall we go back a whole century before the Reformation and hear Martin V. asking Archbishop Chicheley whether England could be called a Catholic country at all, because the King stemmed the influx of Roman persons and ordinances, and Chicheley replying that the whole policy of the Roman Church was greed?

The argument is obviously in the right, if it be taken simply to mean that the Church before the Reformation and the Anglican Church after the Reformation have both had their difficulties. Churches, like individuals, are not likely to escape them.

But all who have followed the history of each, must know that the difficulties of the one and the other are of a totally different kind.

The difficulties of the Church in England before the Reformation were very much the difficulties which have beset the Catholic Church in all times and at all periods. There was then, and is now, the age-long struggle to make Cæsar keep his heavy hands off her property and her liberty. There was, is, and ever will be, the unending battle with the pride and sinfulness of her own unworthy members, resulting in scandals and administrative abuses, against which the

Canons of her councils, from Nicæa to the Vatican, form one persistent and practical protest.

But, amidst all, the Church is inviolably true to her trust. She carries within her the faith that overcomes the world. She knows her own mind, and her heart is at peace. She speaks in the presence of kings and is not abashed. There is peace in her strength, and she walks the way of the centuries, suffering and striving, but ever winning as she goes.

With the Anglican Church the burthen of life takes a different form. She has no struggle with Cæsar. She best knows the reason why. On the other hand, she is driven to distraction by the doctrinal divisions of her own members. Her children are separated by chasms of which the cleft penetrates to the inmost convictions of conscience, and the most sacred depths of their religious sympathies. She suffers from hereditary disintegration. She has to gather under her roof members who, as to the very first principles of Christian belief and worship, are as hopelessly divided as the believing of yes and no can make them, and all day long she has to listen to the jarring of their sempiternal contradictions, and has to soothe her strife-wearied soul by calling it "comprehension".

Such domestic discord in matters of doctrine and worship was as unknown here in England before the Reformation as it is at the present day in the Catholic Church in this or any other country.

Not that heresies were not to be found in that as in every preceding age, but a glance at the Wycliffite trials is sufficient to show us how they were dealt with. When the heretic was discovered, he was, to say the very least, shown to the door, and every one thereafter knew that he was an outsider. Inside the household of the Church was maintained the religious peace and unanimity which befits a body which bears amongst her names the typical title of the earthly Jerusalem.

Men who preferred the mental methods that make for a doctrinal Babylon could only find room for their proclivities

outside her pale. The merest description of the state of things which produced the Lincoln Judgment would have filled mediæval theologians and canonists with amazed and amused bewilderment, and made "merry England" of the fifteenth century ring with laughter.

If, then, the Archbishop thought that the present Anglican condition is preferable, and that when sowers of dissension and revolt must needs arise it is better and safer to be comprehensive and to keep them inside the house rather than outside of it, one can only feel that the Catholic Church, from a very early period, took exactly the opposite view, and acted upon it. We should expect that most military men, who had given to them a fortress to hold, would agree with her.

The marked difference which thus exists between the troubles of Anglicanism and those of the Catholic Church could hardly be better studied than in that very quarrel of Pope Martin V. with the Primate Chicheley, to which the Archbishop alluded.

Without entering into any examination of the complexion given to the event by the Archbishop's words, we may make his allusion the text for an inquiry which more immediately concerns ourselves.

Between the Pope and the English Primate the dispute in point had not the faintest reference to matters of belief or worship. It was purely and entirely a case of administrative friction. But precisely because there was friction, and much more of it than we are likely to find at any other point of the thousand years of our Church history which lies between St. Augustine and the Reformation, the facts have a specially high educational value, and the lesson they teach becomes one of more than ordinary importance and instructive interest.

Before the Reformation the bond between Rome and Canterbury was undoubtedly strong and close. But it is not in those normal periods, when all went merrily as a marriage bell between the Holy See and our Primates, that

one can best gauge the fondness and faith of Roman Authority and of English obedience.

Allegiance, like a chain, is tested by tension. It is at periods of tension that we are furnished with the test of its strength and fibre, and the more extreme the strain and the severer the test, the clearer and surer is the evidence of its thoroughness and endurance.

It is for that reason that the correspondence between Martin V. and Archbishop Chicheley supplies us with a body of testimony far more precious than the glowing letters which passed between Leo III. and King Kenulph, Alexander II. and King Edward the Confessor, or Alexander III. and St. Thomas of Canterbury.

To take in the situation which existed in the first half of the fifteenth century, it will be useful to remember a few main facts.

It is impossible to doubt that during the preceding century public feeling in England, while acknowledging, cordially as ever, the supremacy of the Holy See, felt itself in many ways aggrieved at the manner in which that authority was being exercised. The Popes, by the process known as Apostolic provision, appointed not only to the bishoprics, setting aside Capitular elections, but also to a large number of important benefices throughout the country. As a consequence a multitude of self-seeking persons betook themselves to the Court of Rome, and sought out such preferment, much to the displeasure of local patrons, and often to the detriment of local interests. Many benefices were thus bestowed upon foreigners, who frequently did not reside in the country, and who as frequently could not speak the language of the country when they did. Very large sums were exacted by the Holy See, and were carried out of the kingdom by its collectors in the shape of tithes and first-fruits.

To all of which might be fairly urged as a set-off, firstly, that, as bishops like Grosseteste and archbishops like Scrope cordially admitted, the Supreme Head of the Church had an undoubted right to appoint its chief officers, and that, in truth, very many of the best and most venerable names on

the roll of the Bishops of England—Langton of Canterbury, St. Richard of Chichester, Smith of Lichfield and Lincoln, Waynflete of Winchester—belong to men who owed their appointments to this very method of Papal provision. Secondly, it must be remembered that if Frenchmen and Italians were beneficed here in England, no small number of Englishmen were beneficed in France and Italy. Finally, if England contributed large sums to the Holy See, it was upon the Holy See in turn that devolved the conduct of a vast volume of legal business which English Churchmen themselves brought before it, and into the bargain, at more than one period, the enormous burthen of organising that defence of Christendom against the Turk, without which England of to-day might have been as Asia Minor.

The English Parliament, which if it voiced not the people as a whole, certainly voiced the lay patrons, felt itself called upon to take measures which it deemed to be self-protective. Its power could not pretend to control the Pope, but it could reach the "Rome-runners" or *Romipetæ*, who importuned the Pope into giving them preferment. Accordingly, as the Rolls of Parliament rather quaintly put it, "in aid and comfort of our Holy Father the Pope, who would willingly afford a remedy if he but knew of it" (Act 1365, Rot. Parl.), Parliament passed the Statute of Provisors. By virtue of this fourteenth-century attempt at *Kulturkampf*, those who accepted Papal provisions were liable to imprisonment, and nominations to benefices made by the Pope were declared to be forfeit for that turn to the King.

Such a remedy was both desperate and clearly uncanonical. The English bishops and other lords spiritual at once withheld their assent. The two Primates, in their own name and that of their suffragans, publicly made their protest in Parliament, declaring that they would have no part in anything which was derogatory to the prerogatives of the Apostolic See. They further demanded that this, their protest, as a testimony to future generations, should be formally registered upon the Rolls of Parliament (*Rot. Parl.*, iii., 264).

No doubt such legislation achieved, in its rough and ready way, the end it had in view of frightening the mischievous "Rome-runners". But as to cramping the due exercise of Papal Authority, it had not, and probably was never meant to have, any practical effect. In fact, so much did the country treat the enactments as a dead letter, that we cannot find a diocese in England in which the Pope did not provide bishops far more frequently after the passing of the statutes than he did before it, and what is still more significant, the English kings and bishops themselves were the most anxious that he should do so, as their own letters to the Curia in Rymer's *Fœdera* abundantly bear witness.

The Statute of Provisors was passed under Edward III. in 1351, and that of Præmunire under Richard II. in 1393, and the Popes of that period seemed to content themselves with the fact that the English Archbishops had loudly protested against the enactments, while the clergy on their part had shown their earnestness by frequently petitioning for their repeal. As a matter of fact, the whole difficulty had been very largely smoothed over by a treaty or "Concordia"—one of the earliest concordats—made between the King and Gregory XI. at Bruges in 1374, of which the terms were preponderatingly in favour of the Pope, and in which the exercise of his providing power was fully conceded.

But at the close of the schism of the West, united Christendom hailed with acclamation the accession of Pope Martin V. The new Pontiff is known in history as a man of vast constructive energy and zeal, and as one of the most strong-minded and high-handed of the successors of St. Peter. His was not the temper which would allow him to take the English enactments as quietly as his predecessors. To him they were an insult to his prerogative—"abominable, execrable and detestable statutes" he called them—and forthwith he wrote to King Henry VI., his "Most Beloved Son in Christ, the Illustrious King of England," to demand their repeal.

The King with abundant deference wrote to the Holy Father and explained that before having the statutes re-

pealed, it would be necessary to summon Parliament for the purpose. In the meantime he pledged his royal word that he "would call together the Parliament at the earliest opportunity, and do whatever was possible to be done". He further protested like a loyal son of the Church that he "had no intention whatever to detract or derogate in any way from the rights and privileges of the Apostolic See and of the Holy Roman Church".

The Parliament was duly assembled. To undo at once its own acts, and reverse its own measures, however mistaken, at the bidding of the Supreme Pontiff, might or might not have been an ideally right course to follow.

The Commons had three reasons—not very logical but very intelligible—for not following it.

First, there was the national *amour propre*, which, whether right or wrong—especially when it is in the wrong—has very properly to be reckoned for.

Secondly, there was the natural fear that any readiness to repeal the statutes might be interpreted as a willingness to open the field once more to the intrusion of foreigners and to the renewal of the grievances which the statutes were meant to preclude.

Thirdly, there was the consciousness that the objectionable parts of the statutes were effectively obsolete; that all that the Pope had demanded was as really and practically conceded as if the statutes were already repealed, and the proof of it was to be found in the fact that he himself and his predecessors had been providing to the vacant bishoprics as freely and frequently as if the statutes had never been enacted.

Even Catholic nations, when they go to Canosa, like to go there quietly.

As a result, matters were left to solve themselves, as they generally manage to do satisfactorily where a little goodwill upon both sides gives them a fair chance of doing so. The traditional English attitude of logically wrong but practically right was adhered to, and nothing was done.

Then and thence came the tension.

There were around the person of the Holy Father those

who led him to believe that the disappointing inaction of the English Parliament was due to the apathy of Chicheley, Archbishop of Canterbury. The Pope urged the Primate to bestir himself, and prove his allegiance by bringing about the repeal. In vain the unhappy Primate protested that he had zealously and gladly done all in his power, but without success. The Pope in reply told him that he wanted works and not words. The King, the Bishops, the Temporal Lords, the Universities, all wrote to the Pope imploring the Papal favour in behalf of the Archbishop.

Then happened what, since the days of Langton, had never been heard of in England. The Pope issued letters suspending the Archbishop from his commission as Legate. And the Archbishop, fearing that he was about to be condemned unheard, entered a formal appeal to a future General Council.

It may be rightly argued that since no General Council could be held without the Pope, and no judgment be issued canonically without his sanction, the action of Chicheley at its worst could only mean an appeal from the Pope in Curia to the Pope in Council.

Be that as it may, we touch here the point of the greatest tension of the bond between Rome and England.

That is precisely what we want for an experiment. We wish to see how Catholic England and Rome comport themselves at such critical moments. We wish to see how the temper of each stands the test of the tension.

We shall, as far as possible, allow each to speak for itself, and if we find in what they say any lesson to learn of Catholic loyalty, patience and self-restraint, Dr. Benson's historical instances will not have been quoted in vain for us.

A quarrel properly so called postulates two parties, each of whom considers himself aggrieved by the other.

The more the parties have really come to care for each other—the more it is a case of *amantium iræ*—the more deep and keen the sense of grievance is likely to be. That is one reason why, we may suppose, the course of true loyalty did never yet run smooth.

The opening decade of the fifteenth century found Rome

and England in the midst and worst of one of the hottest altercations which emphasised the fervour of their long and mutual association.

The Church in England had grievances enough and to spare.

The University of Oxford at that time took the trouble to count them, and found no less than forty-six. Not all of these reached England from the side of Rome, but those that did were passing weighty, and, to say the least, did not help her to bear the more easily those that came to her from elsewhere.

On the other hand, Rome had been naturally aggrieved by the English legislation as expressed in the Statutes of Provisors and Præmunire, enacted as they were in the teeth of Canon Law, and despite the protest of the Spirituality. Martin V. felt yet more deeply hurt when the English Parliament evaded his demand that the "superstitious" statutes should be completely abolished. But his grievance reached its climax when he learned from certain people, whose tongues were busy at his Court, that not only the Duke of Gloucester, the Protector of the Kingdom, but Chicheley, the Primate himself, the one prelate in England upon whom he had most right to count, was negligent and half-hearted in furthering the work of the repeal.

And so the quarrel began.

Letters scintillating with heated words passed between Martin V. and Archbishop Chicheley.

History has been happy in preserving these records of warmth, and thus allows us to form our own judgment by doing what is described in Parliamentary phrase as "putting the correspondence on the table".

We take from these letters a few extracts¹ that may enable us to sample with sufficient certainty what is specially the object of our inquiry, namely, the tone and temper of mind in which they were written.

The letters have their value in the fact that they saw the light in an hour of exasperation.

¹The correspondence may be seen in vol. iii. of Wilkins' *Concilia*, 471-86.

If, then, in the system of the English Pre-Reformation Church there existed even the least symptom of latent or incipient Protestantism, or the faintest tendency to take up by anticipation an Anglican attitude, now if ever is the time, and here if anywhere is the place, in which we ought to be able to discover it.

We may note first of all the formula with which Archbishop Chicheley sees fit to begin his first letter, that in which he defends himself and the Duke of Gloucester against his detractors at the Roman Court.

He writes as follows:—

“Most Blessed Father,—Kissing most devoutly the ground before your feet, with all promptitude of service and obedience, and whatsoever a most humble creature can do towards his lord and patron.

[Chicheley uses a stronger word than “patron,” namely, “creator”. (*Et quicquid creatura perhumilis domino suo poterit creatori.*) He employs the term in its canonical sense, that in which we speak of a Cardinal being “created” by the Pope. From being Chancellor of Salisbury he had been consecrated by the Pope, and appointed to the See of St. Davids (A.D. 1408), and subsequently to the Primacy (A.D. 1414), and in both cases by Bulls of Papal Provision.]

“A few days ago, immediately after the departure of the Lord Julian, the Auditor of the Apostolic Chamber and most accomplished Nuncio of the Holy See in England, to my great and heartfelt sorrow, there began to be spread a report—strongly confirmed by the account given by many who had arrived from the Court—which has troubled not a little the minds of many who are most loyal to the Apostolic See.

“It is said that certain detractors, hateful to God, have attempted to embitter the wonted sweetness of your fatherly affection into dislike against the innocent, even against the leading men of this kingdom, and that seeking to gain from the Apostolic See, by the depreciation of others, favours which they have not merited for themselves, they have dared to insinuate poisonous falsehoods concerning the Lord Duke of Gloucester, the protector of the Kingdom, and a most devoted son of your Holiness, and concerning others as well, and

amongst others, concerning me, your most humble chaplain, who have been at all times most faithful to the Apostolic See, alleging that not only the said Duke, but I in particular were the chief hinderers of Church liberty in England, and consequently the opponents of your Holiness."

After assuring the Pope that the Lord Protector had "neither publicly or privately manifested opposition to the behests of your Holiness and of the Apostolic See," but merely, "as a most loyal son of your Holiness," complained of those who calumniated him at the Roman Court, the Archbishop adds:—

"As far as this concerns myself, Blessed Father, He knoweth, to whom nothing is unknown, that they who contrive such things, have found of them in me not even the least trace. But as I am labouring under the weight of years, and have not strength to make my way in person to the feet of your Holiness, they seek to make me so weary of my life that they may shorten my days, few though they be, or perchance do they wish to prevail over me, by driving me to a definite resignation of my see.

"Truly, Most Blessed Father, this one thing the innocence of your son relies upon, and in it with secure hope I will rest at peace, that even as your Holiness designed on a former occasion to promise me in writing, when I was falsely accused in like manner, if vilifiers of this kind, who bite in the dark, try to deal a spiteful blow in the back at me your humble creature, your Holiness will take care to give them neither hearing nor credence.

"In which holy purpose I humbly beseech with the earnestness of the most devout entreaties that your Holiness will deign to continue to confute the malice of these detractors, and, acting as a tender father, will be pleased to put no faith in those uncircumcised lips that easily unbend into words of falsehood, chiefly against your sons of tried loyalty, nor let a shadow of suspicion fall upon your devoted children, until by the evidence of facts or the testimony of authentic documents, grounds for so doing shall have truly been shown to exist. For it is a dictate of the very law of nature itself that the father should not rise up against the

son at the bidding of accusers, but rather that he should deign to learn the truth of the report, and be inclined to pardon. But in those things which have been brought against me, truly I am conscious of nothing, and God is the witness of my innocence."

The reply of Martin V. was not of a kind which could have done much to reassure the Archbishop. The Pope simply bids the Primate prove his words by his works, and secure the repeal of the statutes, which "are a disgrace to the kingdom".

Then the Holy Father adds:—

"There is one correction indeed of your brothership which we cannot pass over in silence. We have heard that you have said irreverently and calumniously that it was for the sake of accumulating money that the Holy See desired the abolition of the statutes".

Whereupon the Pope disclaims the motive alleged, and assures the Archbishop that he is actuated by no other desire than that of maintaining the rights and liberty of the Apostolic See.

Here we may ask, Can it be possible that it is upon the strength of the above passage that Dr. Benson, at the recent Church Congress, saw his way to affirm that "Chicheley replied that the whole policy of the Roman Court was one of greed"?

Certainly, as far as this evidence goes, it is not Chicheley's statement, much less his reply, but something vastly different—an *on dit* at the Roman Court concerning Chicheley. When Dr. Benson adopts such a statement, and puts it into the mouth of Chicheley, he is unwittingly putting himself into the very category of those curial detractors whom Chicheley looked upon as his worst enemies, and of whom he so bitterly complained.

This sharp letter from the Pope drew from the Primate a second letter which throughout its whole context is no less devoted and respectful than the first.

Again it is: "Most Blessed Father, with all promptitude

of service and obedience, kissing most devoutly the ground before your feet ”.

The preservation of deferential tone is the more remarkable, for events had happened in the meantime which must have added heavily to the burthen of the Archbishop's grievance.

Bulls had already arrived from Rome, which were understood to contain an almost unheard-of measure of severity—the sentence by which, on promulgation, the Archbishop was to be suspended from his commission as Legate of the Apostolic See.

The King's officers had promptly taken charge of the Bulls, and kept them unopened until the next meeting of the Privy Council.

No doubt the Pope has an unquestionable right to select his own Legates, and no one can complain if for reasons of his own he chooses to change them. But the office of Legate had been for centuries the traditional right of the Archbishops of Canterbury. Chicheley felt it hard that he should be deprived of it without trial upon charges of hearsay and with his case unheard.

(We may note that this jealous clinging of the head of the English Church to the office and style of Pope's Legate, even in the presence of alleged Bulls of suspension, is surely a striking illustration of the fundamentally Roman character of England's religion in the fifteenth century. Even the least tinge of Anglican feeling in their minds or hearts would have made English prelates, to say the least, indifferent if not positively anxious to get rid of it.)

The Archbishop in this second letter repeats with renewed earnestness his entreaty that the Holy Father will not listen to his detractors, “who,” he says, “I have heard have so moved your Holiness that your Blessedness had commanded to be taken against me, who am most devoted to the Apostolic See and the warmest supporter of your Holiness, measures which are never recorded to have been adopted against the Holy Church of Canterbury, or any of my predecessors from the time of St. Augustine ”.

He pleads “most humbly, for the reverence of God and the honour of the English Church,” that the Pope, whom

“all Christians proclaim as a follower of justice and equity,” will be pleased to appoint Judges before whom he can prove his innocence by canonical process.

“Long before now,” he adds, “were it not for the perils of the journey and for the infirmities of my old age, I would have made my way, Most Blessed Father, to your feet, and approaching you in person, I would have accepted most obediently all things whatsoever your Holiness would have decided.”

At this point the Bishops of England come into action.

They, too, address the Pope:—

“Most Blessed Father, one and only undoubted Sovereign Pontiff, Vicar of Jesus Christ upon earth, with all promptitude of service and obedience, kissing most devoutly your blessed feet.”

They bear witness to the Holy See that the “Archbishop of Canterbury is, Most Blessed Father, a most devoted Son of your Holiness and of the Holy Roman Church”. And that although he has been falsely accused to the Holy See, “he is so rooted in his loyalty, so solid in his allegiance, especially to the Roman Church, that it is known to the whole world, and ought to be to the (Eternal) City, that he is the most faithful son of the Church of Rome, promoting and procuring with all his strength the guarantees of her liberty”.

Then follows a remarkable scene; if we can apply the word to what is enacted in a letter:—

“Reaching you this our humble testimonial, Most Holy Father, We, John, Archbishop of York, William of London, Thomas of Durham, Richard of Lincoln, Philip of Ely, Benedict of St. David’s, Edmund of Exeter, John of Bath, William of Lichfield, Thomas of Worcester, Thomas of Hereford, William of Carlisle, John of Rochester, Philip of Bangor, and John of Chichester, the most humble sons of your Holiness and of the Roman Church, go down upon our knees beseeching you that you be pleased to put full faith in the tenor of our testimony, and fully to clear him who is unjustly accused in the good opinion of your most just Holiness.”

The Bishops go out and the University of Oxford comes in.

It writes as follows:—

“Most Blessed Father, with the most humble and filial commendation, kissing the ground before your feet.

“The University of Oxford, the handmaiden of your Holiness, has rejoiced with the gladness of inmost consolation, while from our place in the body of the Church militant, which was dedicated by the blood which flowed from the side of the Crucified, we behold your august person preside as its head, whom we, with united hearts, undoubtingly recognise as the one Sovereign Pontiff, the Vicar of Christ upon earth, and the most true successor of St. Peter.

“And truly your elevation to the dignity of Supreme Pontiff has brought to us exceeding great joy, since the various members of the Church, weakened by the contagion of the pest of schism, brought now under one head, recover strength throughout the wide extent of her boundaries.”

After dilating upon the acclamations with which the accession of the Pope was hailed by the faithful at large, the University continues:—

“Amongst these, the most humble sons of your aforesaid University have likewise reason to rejoice and to offer their congratulations, the more especially since we have known that the wings of your most holy protection have ever been expanded over us, and many are the ways in which we have felt that the rays of your dignity have unceasingly been directed towards us. Thence on bended knees, and prostrate with all obedience at the feet of your most holy Papacy, from our hearts we pay you the tribute of our thanks.”

Finally reaching the matter in hand, the University, “casting ourselves, most Holy Father, at your blessed feet, with the utmost humility,” entreats that the Pope will turn a deaf ear to the detractors of the Archbishop, whom, they add, the whole nation knows to be “a trusty son of your Holiness and of the Most Holy Roman Church”.

The letter is signed by the “Most devoted sons of your Holiness, the Chancellor and the unanimous body of the Masters of your University at Oxford”.

We must remember that this is the University which, as

Mr. Gladstone has recently assured us, represented above all the lay and national feeling of England.

The University passes from the stage and gives place to the Parliament, voiced by the Lords Temporal:—

“Most Blessed Father, with most humble commendation, kissing most devoutly your blessed feet.”

After an eloquent and fervid eulogy of the Archbishop, they continue:—

“Prostrate at the feet of your Holiness, we most humbly implore that you will take into consideration not the calumnies of detractors, but the most devoted obedience of this our Father towards your Holiness, the multiplied and long-standing proofs of his reverence towards the Holy See and his praiseworthy life, and admit our venerable Father to the grace of your fatherly affection, and to the wonted favour of the Apostolic See.”

Finally, fearing that this multiform intervention of Bishops, Parliament and University was likely to be in vain, Chicheley, as a last resource, took the canonical precaution of making before a notary an appeal to a General Council of the Church. In doing so he emphatically declared himself “to be and to have always been a Catholic and obedient son of the Roman Church and of the Apostolic See, and the zealous defender and promoter of the rights and liberties of the said Church and See to the uttermost of my strength”.

It is pleasing to think that no evidence exists to show that the Pope ever insisted on the promulgation or execution of the sentence of suspension.

Not quite twelve months had been added to the file of these records, and in the May of 1428, we find Martin V. quietly sending, as usual, his Apostolical Benediction to his venerable brother the Archbishop of Canterbury, and regulating the order of public processions in England, while the Primate signs himself just as of yore, “Legate of the Apostolic See,” and commands his suffragans to carry out “as in duty bound” the orders of “our most holy lord”—all very much in the normal swing of Catholic Church

government, and just as if the question of the statutes and the legateship had never arisen to ruffle the peace of Rome or England.

Yet more significant is the fact that the policy of patience was fruitful in practical results. For though the objectionable statutes remained on the page of the Statute Book, and no doubt with a given measure of economic effect, yet Papal provision to the English Sees became thenceforth the rule and not the exception, and the public recognition and working of this, the very high-water mark of Papal Supremacy—*plenitudo Apostolicæ potestatis*, as the King's writs called it—is thus indelibly written in the fasti of every English diocese for more than a century before the Reformation.

The picture of Roman and English relations presented by the incident of Martin V. and Chicheley suggests a reflection.

We Catholics of England to-day are justly proud of our unreserved and unswerving loyalty to the See of Peter.

But our loyalty, undoubted as it is, and ever will be, has happily never been tried by that severest of all tests—the test that proceeds from the source itself to whom the loyalty is due.

Let us, if only for a moment, in historical fairness cast ourselves into the actual position of our forefathers of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. We behold the English Church, one of the fairest of the fields in the vineyard of Christendom, crushed down by many evils—*multis malis attrita*—as Convocation of the time described it. We behold our bishoprics summarily provided from Rome and Capitular elections brushed aside *quasi non fuerint*—foreign and absentee clerics, in large numbers, appointed to our leading benefices—our native clergy constantly and heavily mulcted in tithes and first-fruits by Papal collectors. And if we witness with some expression of regret the endowments bequeathed by the piety of our ancestors being carried out of the country, we are only reminded by the Church lawyers that the Sovereign Pontiff is supreme controller of all Church property—the accepted theory of the time, and

“one which,” says Lyndwood, the great Canonist of that time, and Chicheley’s own official, “we in these days are made to feel down to our finger nails” (*Provinciale. In præfat. Othobon.*, 76).

Putting ourselves in the presence of such causes of national exasperation, we are tempted to ask ourselves a question. We wonder if there are in the ranks of our episcopate, our clergy or our laity of England to-day, those who would be found to address the Holy See with more scrupulous deference, more admirable self-restraint, more patient and affectionate homage, more sterling Catholic faithfulness and loyalty than went forth from this land in the letters of its Primate, its Bishops, its Parliament and its chief University in the fifteenth century?

CHAPTER XLVII.

Anglicanism and the Appeal to Scripture.

(19TH NOVEMBER, 1892.)

Few men are supposed to be more qualified to mark out and describe the Anglican position than Mr. Gore, of the Pusey House, Oxford.

Few, it might be added, are likely to do so with more clearness and thoughtful precision, and with more of that courage of definition, the lack of which leaves unhappily wrapped in mere nebulosity so much of Anglican theology.

At a meeting of the English Church Union (9th Nov., 1892) Mr. Gore dealt with the criteria which differentiate Anglicanism from Romanism.

To non-Catholics such an utterance is all that is opportune.

In these days the Protestant masses are hurling against the Anglican movement the charge of Romanism, or of Romanising, or of being nothing more than a huge national pilgrimage which is theologically making the return-journey from the Reformation, and trending its way by easy stages to the city whither all roads lead.

The Protestant public, arbiter of the future fate of the Establishment, has a right to demand that representative men of the movement shall furnish the frankest assurance

that Anglicanism is neither introductory Romanism, nor yet Romanism in disguise, nor, worst of all, mere Romanism with the Roman Primacy left out.

To this demand the speech of Mr. Gore incidentally offered an answer.

It may not be satisfactory to all of those for whom it was needed—nor even, we should imagine, to all of those in behalf of whom it is given—but it is at least a tangible pronouncement, and reveals with undoubted candour the standpoint from which it is delivered.

Mr. Gore, we take it, rejects the idea that Anglicanism is merely truncated Romanism. He holds that the differences which lie between Anglicanism and Romanism are not merely organic. He maintains that these specific differences enter into the very fibre and penetrate the whole composition of the systems. In other words, the faith of the Anglican and that of the Romanist not only cover a different area of subject-matter, but are framed on a different principle and in a different way.

But how?

Mr. Gore answers by laying his finger upon three things on which these differences bear.

They are:—

1. Scripture.
2. History.
3. Private Judgment.

That is to say:—

In matters of faith and morals, Anglicanism allows an appeal to the Scriptures.

Romanism does not.

Anglicanism in such cases allows an appeal to history.

Romanism does not.

Anglicanism in such cases leaves room for the exercise of private judgment.

Romanism does not.

That is but a rough sketch of what we take to be the drift of the argument, and its precise import must be sought further down and later on in Mr. Gore's own words.

For instance, with regard to the first point, he says :—

The Church of England is justified, I suppose, by this consideration, that Catholicism must exist side by side with other presentations of Catholicism, with three characteristics which can be realised only in the Church of England by the Church of England propagating herself on the lines where God has set her to work. A Catholicism which takes up loyally, and with a full heart of belief, the ancient appeal to Scripture as the criterion in all matters of faith and morals. That was unmistakably the ancient position, that anything should be a matter of faith which shall be really and plainly substantiated by a free appeal to the Holy Scriptures. We are not meant to learn our faith out of the Bible for ourselves ; but taught it by the Church, we are meant to feel for its confirmation in the Scriptures, and to demand that we shall find it. That is, I take it, what we may call the governing consideration in the way of the justification of the Anglican position.

To analyse this principle and the position which results from it, let me for a moment put myself into the place of Mr. Gore's Catholic.

I am not to learn my faith out of the Bible. The Church is to teach it to me. But when she teaches me a given doctrine, I have a right to demand that its confirmation shall be found in Scripture.

Good.

Now, what is to happen if the Church teaches me a doctrine of which to my mind the confirmation is *not* to be found in Scripture ?

Am I to believe it all the same ?

If so, the test or criterion clearly amounts to nothing.

But if I am *not* to believe it, then I must make ready the answer which I must give to the Church who asks me to do so.

Shall I say to her : " You tell me that this doctrine X is contained in Scripture, but I cannot find it there, and so I decline to believe it " ?

The Church will reply : " I am sent by your Maker to teach you, and the Spirit of Truth—the same which inspired the writers of Scripture—abides with me and guides me unto all truth. It is for *me* to tell *you* what is contained in Scripture, and what is not. If I tell you that X is contained in it, it is your duty, as a Christian and Catholic dis-

cept, to believe it, and take my unerring authority as your guarantee that it is so."

How shall I meet this?

Shall I say to the Church: "No. You may say that it is there, but I cannot see it, and until I do see it, I will not believe"?

If I speak thus, I assume that as far as my faith and morals are concerned, it is I—*ego quidem*—not the Catholic Church that am the judge of what doctrines are or are not revealed in Holy Scripture.

Here my position is clear. I am putting myself arm in arm with the Arian and the Nestorian—not, of course, that I adopt their tenets, but that I do adopt what is much more ominous, their credal basis—not the *what* but the *why* of their belief.

For if my answer be allowable, how shall I blame either one or the other? Arius and his party could not see that the *Homoousia* was anywhere implied in Scripture, nor could Nestorius find there the doctrine of the *Theotokos*. On the contrary, both found—and no doubt quite sincerely—that Scripture completely repudiated these doctrines, and both cited, as we know, a multitude of texts to prove it.¹

On the principle above cited, these heresiarchs were abundantly justified in testing the pronouncements of Nicæa and Ephesus by free appeal to Scripture, and in rejecting them when they—they themselves—failed to find in Holy Writ that confirmation which they had a right to demand.

And equally, the Fathers of the Councils were utterly reprehensible when they declared anathema and denied the name of Catholic to those whose only fault was that they acted upon one of the chiefest and plainest criteria of "loyal Catholicism".

Now as Anglicanism accepts the teaching of Nicæa and Ephesus, and endorses its action towards Arius and Nestorius, and as Mr. Gore is an Anglican, it can hardly be that he means that the individual and not the Church is to be the

¹ Long before their time the heretic Paul of Samosatenus told the Patriarch of Alexandria that he would stake the defence of his doctrines "purely on Scripture" (Mansi, i., 1047).

judge of how far a given doctrine has or has not its confirmation in Holy Scripture.

Nor would it help me in the least to urge that it is a matter to be settled for each one by the exercise of his common-sense and sincerity. I have not the faintest grounds for concluding that Arius or Nestorius were wanting in either. And to come to our own times, are we not surrounded by a multitude of living facts in the persons of thousands of dissenters, who despite much learning and undoubted sincerity fail to find any Scriptural confirmation for such doctrines as Episcopacy or Baptismal Regeneration?

It would be easy to cite the name of at least one well-known Unitarian writer and preacher, whose sincerity is beyond question, who cannot discover in the New Testament even a trace of the doctrine of the Atonement.

Mr. Gore then can never have meant that the principle which landed all these men in their present religious position—the claim to judge for themselves whether a doctrine is or is not Scriptural—is to be regarded as an acting criterion of Catholicism.

But if he did not, and if he does not wish me to reply to the Church in the words described, there remains to me but one only alternative answer.

I must say to the Church: "I cannot see for myself that this doctrine which you teach is contained in Scripture, but since you possess the unerring guidance of the Holy Ghost, you must be an infinitely better judge of what Scripture contains or does not contain than I am. I, therefore, set aside my own opinion, and accept your ruling, and hold that the doctrine must be Scriptural, since you, whom Christ appointed to be my teacher, declare it to be so."

But when I adopt this attitude and use this language, and read Scripture with the eyes of the Catholic Church, I am at once acting on what is really the constituent principle of Roman Catholicism. The characteristic which was to distinguish my position from Romanism has absolutely disappeared, and I am a Catholic, not in the sense of Mr. Gore, but in the sense of Leo XIII.

The plain, hard, mathematical fact is, that no man can make three methods out of two terms.

Self and the *Church* are the two terms, one or other of which must determine the content of Scripture. There can only be the method of *self-judgment* or the method of *Church-judgment*.

The first is the method of Arius, and, with him, of every other heretic—for the differences between Arius, Macedonius, Nestorius, Eutyches, Luther and Cranmer are purely quantitative, that is to say, differences of much or little in the subject-matter of faith which they denied. Difference of method or motive principle in the denial there is none. Between the positions of Arius and that of the Church there is, and can be, no *via media*.

Nor are we ever likely to find one until some theologian of the future, having discovered what corresponds in the domain of theology to the philosopher's stone, succeeds in erecting a third determining faculty somewhere midway in the air between the Church and the individual.

Then Roman Catholicism disallows the appeal to Holy Scripture?

By no means.

On the contrary, the writings of the Fathers, the decrees of our Pontiffs, the chapters of our Councils, the treatises of our theologians and the pages of our Catechisms are full of it.

Assuredly the Scriptures were given to us by God for our consolation and instruction. They must for ever hold in the Church a prominent place, and fulfil an exalted office, from which nothing can displace them.

There are three ways of appealing to them.

There is the Appeal for proof or corroboration.

The Church teaches me, as of faith, a doctrine X, and then I find X set forth also in Scripture. Whereupon the fact that God revealed X does not become to me more *certain*, for I have already learned it, and with all possible certainty, as Tertullian says, from God's living Messenger, the Catholic Church, and should have learned it, and cer-

tainly believed it, had the Scriptures never reached me at all; but by seeing it in Scripture the fact becomes to me more *evident*, and all such additional evidence lightens the duty of faith and adds to our consolation.

Hence the homiletic use of the Scriptures.

Moreover, if I seek to convince an outsider, I must, if I am not to beat the air, adapt my arguments to the standards which he professes to recognise. If he has rejected the authority of the Church, but has still retained his belief in Scripture (as most heretics have done), it is to Scripture that for his sake I must make my appeal—to the Old Testament if he be a Jew, and to both Old and New if he be a non-Catholic Christian.

Hence the polemic use of the Scriptures.

The Fathers made frequent and plentiful use of the Scriptures in both ways—homiletic to the insider, and polemic to the outsider, and Catholic theologians, teachers and preachers to this day never cease to follow their example.

There is also the Appeal for guidance.

The Church received from Christ the message of revealed truth (*Depositum Fidei*) which she was commissioned to teach to mankind. If it had been given to her to know expressly then and there from the beginning all that it contained, there would never have been any need of General Councils.

Undoubtedly she knew the truths of the Gospel—how else could she preach them?—but truths are contained and buried in truths, as conclusions are hidden in premises, as scientific deductions are hidden in first principles, and the propositions of Euclid are contained in the first axioms.

Truths that were folded up in other truths are gradually folded out, and the process of unfolding makes up that work of doctrinal development which extends from the Council of Nicæa to the Council of the Vatican.

At the Council of Florence¹ in 1438 this principle of doctrinal evolution received its name of Development—

¹ Sess. vi.; Mansi, xxxi., c. 566 *et seq.*

ἀνάπτυξις. It is described as the process by which the inner truths (*τα ἔγκειμένα*) are unfolded or drawn out from the body of the Faith in which they previously lay hidden (*τῷ προϋποκειμένῳ*), just as truths are evolved from principles or premises in which they were, *not explicitly*, but implicitly (*οὐκ ἀνεπτυγμένως ἀλλὰ συνεπτυγμένως*) contained. This process is defined as an unfolding or *development* from within, in contradistinction to an *addition* to the Faith from without (*προσθήκη*). The principle was ably expounded by the Bishop of Rhodes to explain the inclusion of the *Filioque* clause in the Creed. It was substantially the same as the principle pointed out by Vincent of Lerins as *profectus* or progress, and noted by the schoolmen as "*non profectus fidei in fidei, sed profectus fidelis in fide,*" *viz.*, not an increase of the Articles of Faith in the mind of the Faithful, but an increase or progress of the mind of the faithful in the Articles of the Faith.

In such a work the Church does not add to her message any more than a man adds to his cloak when he unrolls it from his portmanteau.

Let me suppose that the doctrine X has been folded up in two other doctrines V and W, which are its logical premises. It is clear that X always existed in them (as for instance the doctrine of the *Homoousia* defined at Nicæa is contained in (a) the Unity of the Divine Nature, and (b) the Divinity of Christ, and the *Theotokos* in the (a) Motherhood of the Blessed Virgin, and (b) the Unity of Christ's person), and thus we can truly affirm that from the very beginning X was held by the Church in its implicit or folded-up condition.

Yet a very long lapse of centuries may pass over before the Church arrives at the stage where she folds it out, and reaches or works out the conclusion. Before that time X may not have been *de fide*, namely, a known and defined Article of Faith. (It might even happen that during that stage X might be denied or called in question, as, for instance, in the case of certain Catholic Churches of Asia which are said to have rejected in the third century the term *Homoousia*, that the Council of Nicæa insisted upon and defined as an

Article of Faith in the fourth.¹) But after that stage X becomes explicitly *de fide*, and binding on Catholic belief.

If we ask why, the reason is obvious.

Because faith is due to that which we know to be contained in God's word. Before the definition, the Church had not assured herself, and consequently had not affirmed that X was contained therein.

After that time she became sure, and from that moment and concomitantly with such certainty there arose the obligation of believing it and requiring it to be believed.

In this work of doctrinal evolution, which connotes the Church's growing insight into the fulness of the meaning of her Message, the Church is assisted or guided, but not inspired. Her mind is left free to make the perceptions, work out the conclusions, to adjust the applications, and to work its way under the direction of the Holy Spirit, but in human fashion, to the required definition according to the lights and means which lie at her disposal. Hence, like all works of human industry, the results are written in the texture of time and of circumstance. But the Holy Spirit, pledged to guide her "unto all truth" provides by unfailing assistance, that in this process the Church shall be preserved from error. He does not lift her up by inspiration and spirit her over the bridge, but by His assistance, He is the parapet wall on either side, which prevents her from falling or deflecting as she walks her way across it.

In this august function of doctrinal definition, upon which the Church's life and the world's guidance so much depend, by far the most important and the most precious of all her helps and resources must ever be Holy Scripture. It is the *materia ex quâ*, the quarry of all her dogmatic conclusions.

Hence in the conciliar debates which precede definitions of faith, and still more so in their natural introduction, the debates of the Theological Schools throughout the world, which for centuries previously have threshed out the issues and shaped Church opinion, there is and must be a constant appeal to the text of Scripture.

¹ See Newman's *History of the Arians*, chap. ii., 4.

A glance at the pages of Passaglia's work on the Immaculate Conception, or the chapters of the Vatican Council, would suffice to show how this appeal is made the very groundwork of all doctrinal research and definition.

In both these forms of appeal—the Appeal for proof and the Appeal for guidance—the Catholic Church is unceasingly occupied in fulfilling the direction to “search the Scriptures”.

The third form of Appeal is that which for want of a better word we may call the appeal *against*.

It is clear that in the foregoing cases the word “appeal” is used merely in the sense of having recourse to a means. We turn or appeal to Scripture for corroborative proofs of what the Church has defined, and also for guidance before she makes a decision.

But when she has spoken we cannot appeal to Scripture against her.

I may appeal to the testimony of my witnesses to show that a judge's decision was right, or to urge him to pronounce a given sentence, but all that is clearly a very different matter from appealing over his head to a superior court and against his decision.

In the Catholic Church there is not any appeal against the Catholic Church, either to Scripture or any other authority. Such a “dividing against itself” has no place in God's kingdom. It is to be found elsewhere.

Moreover, I am debarred from making an appeal against the Church to Scripture, for the plain reason that the Church herself is the accredited expounder of Scripture, and consequently the two authorities form but one and the same tribunal. The appeal *against*, therefore, is not—as I might flatter myself—to the Scripture *versus* the Church, but simply an appeal from the Church's judgment of the meaning and content of Scripture to my own individual judgment of both—in other words, an appeal which can only be described as “Scripture according to the Church” *versus* “Scripture according to me”.

If Mr. Gore uses the word “free appeal to Scripture” in the first two meanings, he is at one with us and the Catholic

Church, but then the characteristic which was to mark off Anglicanism from Romanism has vanished and melted away.

But if he uses the word in the third and un-Catholic sense—the appeal *against*—and singles out such a principle as a characteristic of Anglicanism as distinguished from Romanism, we are only too sorry to think what an unhappy amount of truth lies in his contention.

He would thus erect, indeed, a fence between him and us, but only by doing what surely many of his brethren will witness with sorrow—by removing the sole barrier which could be regarded as separating the Anglican system, with its earnest yearnings and its Catholic ambitions, from the sad common ground on which all Protestantism and all heresies, past, present and future, must forever take their stand.

Whether the appeal to history and the appeal to private judgment in its more direct form furnish any sounder criterion, we may leave for future inquiry. But, in the meantime, Mr. Gore's first characteristic seems to us to either mean absolutely nothing at all to the Protestant masses, or a great deal too much for the nobler ideals of the English Church Union.

Mr. Gore claims for Anglicanism that it is distinguished from Romanism, not alone by one characteristic mark, but by three.

He writes down as the first the free appeal to Scripture. We have already attempted to state some of the difficulties which appeared to us to attach to the use of this criterion.

He adds to this two others. These we may call briefly the Appeal to History and the Appeal to Conscience.

It will be more satisfactory to allow Mr. Gore to convey his meaning in his own words.

After describing in the terms which we cited the free appeal to Scripture as “the governing consideration in the way of the justification of the Anglican position,” he adds:—

There is another. It is that Catholicism must exist in such a form that it can really be free in the face of history; maintaining no document as part of the faith which cannot, under the demands

of history, be really substantiated as having always belonged to the faith of the Church. And then, thirdly, a Catholicism which can frankly and legitimately challenge an appeal to the individual conscience and personality. I believe these are three main positions of Anglicanism among other branches of the Catholic Church: free appeal to Scripture, attitude of freedom, and free appeal to historical investigation, and that it challenges and lays on the individual conscience that amount of responsibility which is the truth of what we call private judgment.

Here Mr. Gore takes his stand upon ground which is admirably clear.

It is the ground of the Three Appeals.

He describes the Anglican position as a Trilateral, of which free appeal to Scripture forms one front, free appeal to history a second, and free appeal to conscience a third.

But when we come to look into it, these three are one. And it is Mr. Gore's last word that gives the clue to the synthesis.

I may constitute myself the judge of what is or is not contained in Scripture. And having done so, there is certainly no reason why I should not, with equal fitness, be to myself the judge of what is or is not the true reading of history. And finally, having heard what Scripture and history have to say upon a given point, I may sit as Judge Ego in Supreme Court of Conscience to decide too whether it is true or false, right or wrong.

And while I am doing so, I may with very pardonable generalisation speak simply of "Scripture" when I really mean *my* interpretation of Scripture, and of "History" when I mean *my* reading of history, and of "Conscience" when I mean the opinion which *I* have pronounced as to whether a given proposition is righteous or unrighteous, reasonable or unreasonable.

But the beginning, middle and end of the whole process is plainly Private Judgment.

It is the one and the same weapon of Private Judgment with its point turned in three directions, and exercised in the triple domain of Scripture, history and personal opinion.

Naturally and necessarily there is in all three a scope within which the exercise of Private Judgment is not only legitimate but indispensable. There is a sphere, especially in matters of history, and in ultimate decisions of conscience, in which I am bound to judge for myself, and in which, if I do not, no other person can or will.

All the same I have to guard against self-deception.

I have to ask myself whether all this means that Scripture, History and Conscience are my Court of Appeal, as Mr. Gore implies—or something widely and sadly different, that *I* am the Court of Appeal sitting in judgment on matters of Scripture, History and Conscience. I may find out that these three authorities are not my judges, but simply the three departments in which I myself pronounce judgment!

In this world we have to deal with two Ideals. Both are beautiful and good, but one more so than the other. Fortunately we have not to part with either, but only to follow each in its own plane of application.

We take the first, which we may call the Ideal of Free Thought.

It would be surely hard to find a Triad of names more august than those which Mr. Gore has invoked—Scripture, History and Conscience. God's written word—the memory of mankind—and the holy of holies, with its shekinah of God's guidance within the human soul.

Little wonder that men should seek as a worthy usher to such thrones a fourth, Liberty—one hardly less lovable and sacred than themselves.

That in Scripture we should possess God's Holy Word, that by History our minds should be enriched with the consciousness and experience of the race, and that by Conscience we should have God's voice within us, are indeed blessings beyond comparison, and that we should possess and use them freely as the Giver intended them to be possessed and used, must be assuredly God's best interest and our own.

If it is this possession and use that are meant by "appeal," then the very system of Catholicism demands such an appeal, and within its true limit the more free and full and frequent the appeal the better.

Let us not underestimate the value of such an Ideal. Few things are more beautiful or precious than liberty, and the noblest of all forms of liberty is liberty of thought.

It is good that our minds should be free to examine freely whatever is contained in Scripture, in history, in science, and to form their judgment thereon.

Had God left man to himself, this mental freedom—the Ideal of Free Thought—would have been not only good, but probably the best and highest condition we could conceive for mankind.

But the Ideal of Liberty and Truth-seeking, high and worthy as it is, is, after all, the less noble of the two.

A second and higher Ideal is that of Divine discipleship.

When God takes us into His confidence, and becomes Himself our Teacher, and shares His Divine Mind with us, a new and higher era begins for us, and a second and nobler Ideal starts into being with the fact of God Revealing.

God has thus intervened, not to take our mental freedom away, but to cap it with a gift which is higher still—namely, Revelation.

It is good that we should be free to think and judge as we please. But it is better still that God should speak to us. It is good that our minds should be free to seek Truth in all places. But it is better still that the Truth itself should speak to us, and, like the Spirit, say "Come".

If it is a blessing that we should have absolute liberty in all things to think and judge for ourselves, it is a still greater blessing to be, as the Prophet says, "taught of God".

But it is to be observed that we cannot enjoy the higher Ideal—Revelation or discipleship—without suffering a loss or limitation of the lower Ideal—Freedom of Thought.

Freedom of thought, by its very meaning, requires that we may question all things, and that every question shall remain open to our investigation. But from the moment that God speaks, His word closes to free discussion every question upon which He pronounces. We cannot, with either reverence or reason, hold a dubitative inquiry into the truth of what we know that He said.

Hence it comes that these two greatest of Ideals are mutually exclusive of each other on the same territory. We can have each in its own domain. But we cannot have both on the same subject-matter. When Revelation comes in, Free Thought goes out. What Revelation occupies, Free Thought must evacuate. We cannot have God's word on a point and still hold ourselves free to question it.

In other words:—

We can use our Private Judgment freely until we find God and His Revelation, but once having found it, we cannot use our Private Judgment to test for ourselves the truth of what He tells us.

Why will not Protestant writers honestly face the facts of their position, and why will they persist in vaunting their freedom of inquiry in the same breath in which they thank God for His revelation? They can have one or the other. But no logical Christian can have both. Revelation means restriction of the area of Free Thought.

To see exactly how these principles work in the Catholic system, I have only to go back and put myself in the position of an inhabitant of Judæa in the days of Christ.

I have been to Christ, have witnessed Him work His miracles, and have listened to His preaching. I have heard His claim, and I have had put before me the proofs of miracle and prophecy which go to establish it.

I inquire into the evidence, and prayerfully test and weigh it, asking myself if this "be indeed the Son of God".

All this examination into Christ's claim makes up the first stage, and clearly it is throughout one of Private Judgment.

The case is one which is ultimately decided in the court of my individual conscience.

Christianity does not, therefore, bar or exclude Private Judgment. On the contrary, it makes its very primary appeal to it. It demands it, and makes room for it. The function of Private Judgment is to do for the would-be believer what St. Andrew did for St. Peter—bring him to Christ.

(Archbishop Whateley might surely have spared himself several pages of a very elaborate argument against the

Catholic system could he have but read what is stated on this point in the elementary chapters of Catholic theology.)

When I have convinced myself that Christ is indeed the Son of God, come here on earth to be my Teacher, the first stage—that of inquiry—has closed, and the second stage—that of discipleship—has begun.

But in it Private Judgment ceases to act.

When Christ teaches me a given truth—for instance, the fall of Jerusalem—I cannot say to Him, “All this catastrophe which You foretell seems to me flatly contradictory of the glorious promises of Isaiah. I would gladly believe Your words, but I feel that it is contrary to Holy Scripture.”

If I believe at all that Christ is God, or if I am at all a Christian, I cannot—to use a current phrase—“think for myself” on what He teaches me, or go behind His teaching, or appeal to Scripture against what He tells me.

It is equally clear that if Christ teaches me a given truth, I cannot proceed to test it by reference to history. I cannot say to Him: “I would believe what You say, were it not that there is what appears to me an overwhelming amount of historical evidence against it”.

If Christ teaches me yes, and history appears to me to say no, it would be clearly treason to my Christian faith to appeal from His teaching to history. My reading of history *may* be wrong, but He is God, and His teaching *must* be right, and as for me as a Christian, there cannot be even a shadow of hesitation as to which I must accept.

Nor when He teaches me the stupendous doctrine of the Holy Trinity, with its mysterious Unity of Nature and Threeness of Persons, can I say to Him: “I cannot see the truth of this doctrine, or reconcile it with my individual reason, and, therefore, I must decline to believe it”.

I can only say: “You are my God and my Teacher. Whatsoever You say must be true. It is not for me to judge Your word, but to accept it and believe it.” “Speak, Lord, for Thy servant listeneth.” “Thou art the Son of God. Thou hast the words of Eternal Life.”

So it is that Christians, by the very nature and tenor of their Christianity, are bound to make a surrender of their

Private Judgment, and lay it at the feet of Christ, and Christ's very position as the Revealer requires that they should do so. By the very fact of recognising a Divine Teacher, they recognise that there is, and must be, a circle of truth covering the whole content of what He has taught, within which all discussion, except for corroboration and exposition, is necessarily closed, and within which there can be no questioning appeal to Scripture or to history or to the individual judgment.

Not indeed that the economy of Revelation infringes upon our liberty in any one of these three domains, any more than the revelation of the Beatific Vision hereafter will in any true sense diminish our freedom. If it exempts a given area of truth from our questionings, it is only because it gives us over that area a higher and better form of our liberty. If I put into the hand of the miner in the morning before he goes down into his mine the nugget of gold that he is about to seek, I may be said indeed to limit or take away his liberty of search for that particular piece of gold, but surely not in a manner that he is likely to object to. The possession of truth must ever be something nobler than even the quest of it. The Ideal of Revelation and discipleship does not impugn the Ideal of Free Inquiry, but it transcends and supersedes it, inasmuch as by the fact of God's speech the sure possession of the truth is substituted for that which is no longer necessary—the free research after it.

The position which Mr. Gore would choose for Anglicanism by his free and triple appeal, seems to us to be, in last analysis, based on a return to the lower Ideal from the higher, and to be at least suggestive of a reversal of the natural order by instituting an appeal from the higher to the lower, and testing the data of Revelation by the exercise of Free Inquiry.

It seems abundantly clear that if the Church of Christ is the accredited expounder of Revelation, and continues on earth Christ's office of Teacher, and is the Living Authority in which Christ so teaches "all days" that He could say,

“ Who heareth you heareth Me ”—my attitude towards the Church in the nineteenth century, as far as discipleship is concerned, must be precisely the same as it would have been towards the Apostles or to Christ Himself in the first.

I may and must use my Private Judgment until I find her and verify her claims; but having found her, a new era begins for me. Thenceforth, I am face to face with the Divine Teacher. The stage of free and doubting inquiry is over, and the higher stage of discipleship has begun. What the Church teaches me as part of Christ's Revelation will certainly preclude within the area of its content all exercise of Private Judgment. I cannot argue with God or His Messenger. The Church carries the light of Revelation for Christ, and within the circle of its rays there can be no place for dubitative discussion or inquiry. If we believe that she is Christ's infallible mouthpiece, charged to say to us what He Himself said, there can be no appealing from her either to Scripture or history, or to my Personal Judgment, any more than there could be were I standing before Christ who sent her.

The conclusion which seems to flow from these facts is as follows :—

As surely as God has made a Revelation, and as surely as He has founded a Church to convey to us that Revelation, so surely must that Church have around her a circle of truth, inside of which there can be no appeal to any other authority, and in which any appeal could be nothing less than a treason to God the Revealer.

The Catholic Church, if she speaks for Christ, who sent her, must necessarily speak like Him, and “ as one having authority ”.

If it had fallen to the lot of Mr. Gore to set forth the criteria of such a Church—a Church really teaching for Christ, and whose authority, supreme, final, peremptory and decisive, rings forth in the *anathema sit* of Catholic antiquity—the very first duty which would have confronted him would have been that of insisting on this higher attitude of discipleship for her members, and of claiming for her a

territory of truth inside of which there neither must nor can be freedom of sceptical inquiry or appeal.

There may indeed be inquiry into the credentials of the Church, as Christ's Messenger, or into the credentials of Christ Himself, as the Divine Teacher, but the truth of these credentials once conscientiously established, there can be logically or loyally no questioning inquiry or *examen dubitativum*, as the theologians say, into the truth of the teaching.

Dealing with the Anglican system, Mr. Gore has been led to do—and we think quite rightly—precisely the reverse.

When he assures us that Anglicanism is marked off from Romanism by the fact that it allows from its teaching a free appeal and a threefold appeal, he appears to us to go out of his way to furnish what is the unanswerable proof that the system which he thus describes cannot possibly be any part of the authoritative Church which Christ sent to teach in His name.

A Church which carries Christ's message to mankind, and Christ's authority to teach it, can suffer no appeal from her teaching.

If her message and teaching authority are Divine, she is bound to insist on them, and there is nothing to which we can appeal from them.

If they are not Divine, she has no business to teach us at all.

CHAPTER XLVIII.

Anglican Theory—St. Peter and the Apostles and the Bishops.

(18TH FEBRUARY, 1893.)

NOTHING is more reasonable than that those who are sincerely attached to the Anglican system should band themselves together to defend it, and it is decidedly better for them, and for us, that if they are to labour to establish its claims at all they should do so in the most direct, intelligent and practical way.

From a Catholic point of view a movement of Anglican apologetic is in many ways welcome and hopeful. It can hardly proceed at all without at every step submitting and

keeping present to the mind of the English people momentous religious issues—notably those between Anglicans and ourselves—which it is our first and highest interest should be constantly and closely considered. No doubt it is equally our interest that the true answer should accompany the statement of the issues, and here the movement may diverge from us; but it is immeasurably better for us, and for the cause of Catholic truth, that the nation should think of these questions, even amid the mists of misguided pleading, than that it should cease to think of them at all. We have sufficient faith in the constitution of the human soul to feel sure that if it only thinks and prays often enough, and long enough, and earnestly enough on any question, in nine cases out of ten it will think and pray itself into the right. It is not from thought but from religious ignorance and indifferentism that we have any reason to fear, and if with the desolation of heresy and unbelief the land is laid desolate, it is not from thinking but from the want of thinking, and that prayerful thinking which Holy Writ calls “thinking in the heart”.

But it interests us not less than Anglicans that the case between us should be clearly and effectively stated. That is to say, it cannot be good for apologists on either side that time and effort should be wasted in mistaking each other's position, or in mutual misunderstanding of each other's terms and tenets, or in the weariness of making long argumentative strides which are not in the way.

The first condition of success ought to be accuracy of aim. If the arguments supplied are to meet the purpose for which they are intended, they ought to be presumably of a kind which would hold the Anglican reader firm in his convictions, even if it should be his lot some day to talk the matter over with a well-instructed Catholic friend, or to study it for himself in an accredited manual of Catholic doctrine.

Let us take as a fair sample an argument which *The Church Review* put into the hands of its Anglican readers:—

It is an equally sound theological axiom that “one passage of Holy Writ must not be interpreted so as to contradict any other passage”. Therefore, on this point, as well as on the point men-

tioned last week, it would be bad theology to interpret St. Matt. xvi. 18 as making St. Peter "the Foundation of the Church"—*i.e.*, the source of all ecclesiastical and spiritual power, authority and jurisdiction—for we find in very many passages indeed that such a proposition is explicitly and implicitly refuted. (1) Our Lord, in giving His Apostles their commission and authority to act in His Name, as spiritual guides of the world, addresses them all in terms of absolute equality—*e.g.*, "Whatsoever *ye* shall bind" (St. Matt. xviii. 19); "Go *ye* and teach" (St. Matt. xviii. 19); "I send the promise of the Father upon *you*" (St. Luke xxiv. 49); ". . . *ye* remit . . . *ye* retain" (St. John xx. 22, 23). (2) The Acts of the Apostles tell us that Christ gave to *all* His Apostles, equally, instructions as to how to govern and regulate the affairs of His Church (Acts i. 2). (3) Not only have we records of these general intimations of Christ's will that the Apostles should be reckoned equal, but we are told repeatedly that He refused to nominate any one of them as chief (St. Matt. xx. 26-28; xxiii. 8).

To meet such a plea the Catholic would at once feel that the best reply would be found in a simple explanation of the teaching of the Church.

For the Anglican argument has hardly proceeded beyond its opening sentence when it seems to fall into a singular misapprehension of the Catholic position.

The Catholic doctrine that St. Peter is the Foundation of the Church, is apparently taken to mean that we hold St. Peter—and, presumably, his successors the Popes—to be "the *source* of all ecclesiastical and spiritual power, authority and jurisdiction".

Here we have a supposition which the Catholic would certainly not be prepared to admit, without first making limitations of the most serious kind.

For instance: the other Apostles were not ordines of St. Peter.

We take St. John. His Apostolic power ("ecclesiastical and spiritual power, authority and jurisdiction") means simply two things.

Primarily, it includes the power of *Order*, namely, the fulness of the Priesthood which Christ shared with His Apostles.

To wit:—

The power of offering the Sacrifice of the Eucharist.

The power of forgiving sins.

The power of giving the Holy Ghost in Confirmation.

The power of transmitting this Priesthood by Ordination. These are the powers of the High Priesthood.

But secondly, there is the authority or commission to exercise these and other powers over Christ's flock, and that we call *Jurisdiction*.

Obviously, Order is more important than Jurisdiction. First, because it is inherent in the person, while Jurisdiction is not; and, secondly, because Order is usually presupposed by Jurisdiction.

Order and Jurisdiction are thus the two elements of Apostolic Authority.

Does Catholic faith teach that St. John derived them from St. Peter as from a source?

By no means.

With regard to the chief and most essential power of Order, with its group of constituent powers which make up the fulness of the Priesthood, we are taught that the Apostles received them *immediately* from Christ.

For these powers are given in a Sacrament. And in a Sacrament Christ deals with the soul directly and immediately. St. Thomas Aquinas therefore teaches that when the consecrating bishop conveys the priestly powers to the person to be ordained, he acts only instrumentally, even as the baptiser does to the baptised. The grace and the power are directly from God (3, q. 82, c. 10).

If I am baptised by X, the grace of regeneration wrought within me does not pass to me through the soul of X. The inflow of grace into my soul is directly from the Holy Ghost, whom Christ sends into it to work its sanctification. The part of X is to do with due intention the outward sign of the Sacrament, the pouring of the water and pronouncing of the words. His action is extrinsic. But to it is annexed the work of the Holy Spirit, which is direct and intrinsic. That is why this effect is the same, whether X's soul be saintly or sinful, for X's soul is outside of the work, save as to the intentional doing of the outward sign. In other words, the minister of a Sacrament is not the *channel* of the grace conferred, but only the outward *instrument* of a Sacrament in which the Holy Spirit Himself immediately be-

stows the grace upon the recipient. (Hence the deplorable mistake made by Protestants who imagine that in the Catholic Sacramental system the priest "comes between" the soul and the Saviour.)

As the collation of the priestly powers of Order are Sacramental, the same law holds good in an ordination.

Thus, not only St. John but every other Apostle held the fulness of his priesthood *immediately* from Christ. *Hic est qui baptizat.*

And every Catholic bishop holds the fulness of his priesthood in precisely the same manner at the present day. The Pope is no more a source in the one case than St. Peter was a source in the other.

The Pope is the ministerial head of the Church on earth, just as the bishop is the ministerial head of the diocese. But Christ is not only the Supreme Ministerial Head of the Church, from whom all ministers derive authority, but the *Vital* Head of the Church, from whom all receive supernatural life and sanctification.

But the secondary power of Jurisdiction?

Did St. John receive his jurisdiction from St. Peter?

Catholic faith has never insisted on such a belief.

Christ Himself gave jurisdiction to His Apostles. Leading theologians at the Council of Trent, like Lañez, maintained that all the Apostles received their jurisdiction immediately from Christ. Others, like Salmeron, thought that they received it from Christ, "but through Peter" (Session xxiii.).

But the mere fact that the point was an open one at Trent, and so remains in Catholic theology to the present day, plainly bears witness that no article of Catholic faith requires us to hold that the Apostles derived from St. Peter, as from a source, either their power of Order or of Jurisdiction.

That the Apostles should look to St. Peter as their chief, and as the one to whom Christ gave the power of confirming them, and that they should exercise their Divine Commission in such measure of subordination as Church Unity might require, is sufficiently intelligible. But St. Peter's supremacy, as taught by the Catholic Church, does not at all require that

he should have been the source of spiritual power, whether of Order or Jurisdiction, to his brother Apostles, and Anglican arguments merely weaken their own relevance and point as often as they assume it to be otherwise.

Let us pass from the Apostles and consider the bishops.

Bishops are not theologically the same as the Apostles. The Episcopate is not quite upon the same level as the Apostolate.

Undoubtedly the bishops, taken collectively, are the successors of the Apostles. Undoubtedly they possess, with them, the fulness of the same High Priesthood.

Hardly any form of zeal would be more pitifully short-sighted and un-Catholic than that which would seek to glorify the Papacy by persistently minimising the constitutional status and dignity of the Episcopate. It is certainly not the policy of the Papacy itself, as we see by the eloquent letter addressed by Leo XIII. to the Bishops of Spain. The Episcopate is Christ's handiwork, and none but a sacrilegious hand can be lifted to impair its prerogative. It can never be a service to the Spouse of Christ, "all fair" in the stately symmetry of her faultless form, to depict her after the manner of those grotesque figures of the ordinary caricature of the comic press, in which a colossal head is seen to rest upon a mere pedestal of dwarfed and diminished members.

Catholicity is ecclesiastical beauty, and beauty is balance and proportion. Thence we take it that earnest-minded Anglicans who are rightly jealous of aught that would mar in the Church of Christ the maintenance and diffusion of the Apostolic dignity as inherited by the Episcopate, would surely find in a closer study of the Catholic system enough to fulfil their highest ideals, and certainly enough to remove their apprehensions.

But theology least of all can afford to ignore facts.

There are two facts which differentiate the Apostles from the bishops.

The first fact is that the first bishops were not co-opted into the Apostolic College. They were not numbered with the Twelve. They were not added to the Apostles' own

body, or made fellow-Apostles. They were, at the most, mere appointments made by one or other of the Apostles.

The second is that the Apostles, in thus constituting the bishops, did not place them upon the higher plane of the Commission to the Universal Church upon which they themselves stood, but upon the lower one of limited and local Jurisdiction.

The Apostles held from Christ a joint universal jurisdiction over the *whole* earth. The bishops were given by the Apostles a local and limited jurisdiction solely in the places to which they were appointed.

Hence if the Catholic system makes a practical distinction between Apostles and bishops, it can hardly be said that in doing so it is acting arbitrarily, or that it is merely animated with an architectural purpose in lowering the floor around the Apostolic Chair of Peter.

The import of this difference between the *status* of the Apostolic College and the Episcopate makes its mark in the Catholic system in the following distinction:—

We believe that the Apostles received not only their power of order immediately from Christ, but their power of jurisdiction as well.

Catholics believe in like manner that the bishops of the Church inherit the same fulness of the High Priesthood, and receive the plenitude of the power of order immediately from Christ.

In this, the fulness of their High Priesthood, all bishops, whether of Rome or of Little Rock, are absolutely equal and alike, and this community in the substantial possession of the plenitude of priesthood fixes for ever the relation and attitude of the Sovereign Pontiff to the bishops as that of fraternity, and one in which he ever addresses them as his "Venerable brethren".

But Catholic theologians teach that the bishops' power of *Jurisdiction* is imparted to them by Christ, not immediately, like that of the Apostles, but through the Apostolic See as the centre of Unity; for power to rule a part of the flock of Christ can obviously only come from him whom Christ commissioned to feed and pasture the whole. Those

are rightful bishops, as the Council of Trent teaches, whom St. Peter and his successors, as the divinely appointed Chief Shepherds, assume into a share of their solicitude.

That the powers of Order, which are Sacramental, should be conferred immediately by God, while powers of Jurisdiction, which are not Sacramental, should be conveyed immediately from men, is an obvious and natural distinction.

Cardinal Hergenröther expresses this truth by saying: "Theologians teach that the power of *Order* of bishops proceeds *immediately* from God; not so the power of *Jurisdiction*, for this is given to men to confer".¹

It is only in this sense, as far as jurisdiction is concerned, and as far as the bishops of the Church are concerned, that St. Peter and his successors can be rightly described as the "source" of ecclesiastical authority.

While the bishops hold the main element of their spiritual power—the power of order—immediately and inalienably from God, they hold the second element of their authority and jurisdiction from Christ, through the Pope.

But here again Catholic belief interposes an important qualification.

We are to remember that the fact that the bishop thus holds his jurisdiction from the Apostolic See does not at all put him in the position of a mere deputy or delegate of the Pope. He is invested with ordinary jurisdiction as a true Shepherd over a given portion of Christ's flock, and takes his rightful place as one of that body which the "Holy Ghost has appointed to rule the Church of God".

It may be of interest to note the precise difference which exists between ordinary and delegated authority. It is very much like that which lies between a *gift* and a *loan*. (A gift once conferred becomes the possession of the receiver, and the receiver cannot without just and lawful cause be deprived of it. A loan is something not given but merely entrusted to the receiver and may be recalled by the giver.) When a person is appointed by the Pope to a given bishopric, he be-

¹ *Catholic Church and Christian State*, vol. i., 180.

comes the incumbent or possessor of the see. He receives an office or post which is a normal part of the order and constitution of the Church. Hence jurisdiction is annexed to the post, and is conferred with it. And because it is thus annexed to the post, and therein to the person appointed to it, it is called *Ordinary* jurisdiction, and the person appointed is called the *Ordinary* of the Diocese. He holds possession of the office by the law of the Church, and nothing but a grave offence on his part against the law of the Church or some grave necessitating cause would justify any deprivation or suspension of his jurisdiction. A bishop's diocese is thus his freehold, as long as he observes the Church's law and works in due obedience to the supreme Church Authority.

Delegated authority is upon quite a different basis. It is merely entrusted for a time to the receiver for a given purpose, and may be recalled at pleasure. The receiver is merely a deputy, or delegate, or vicar, and like a nuncio or a commissary may have his powers withdrawn at any moment, since they are held not by law or possession but by the good pleasure of the delegator.

It is precisely because the Bishop's authority is *ordinary* and entrenched in the law and constitution of the Church, that we can readily understand how in the earlier centuries diocesan bishops were appointed without immediate reference to Rome, whereas in later times bulls of appointment were required. In order that a bishop should be duly appointed he must receive jurisdiction over the flock assigned to him. Such jurisdiction can only be conferred by the Supreme Church Authority. But the collation of it may be conceived as being made in one of two ways. The Supreme Authority may say to the bishop, I appoint you bishop of X and give you jurisdiction. Or the Supreme Authority may say to the Church, as often as a see is vacant and as certain forms have been duly fulfilled in the election of a bishop, I recognise the person so elected and confirmed as having jurisdiction. In the first case, the authority collates jurisdiction personally; in the second case, it collates it, so to speak, automatically by the mere fulfilment of the law. The one is *ab homine* the other *a jure*. In the earlier period (especi-

ally when recourse to a common centre would be difficult and troublesome) the method of collation would naturally take the form of annexing the jurisdiction to the due fulfilment of legal conditions. Later on, in a more highly developed organisation, it would be open to the Church Authority or to its supreme depository, the Pope, to insist on the personal method of collation. For in either case the chief authority in the Church is the source of jurisdiction, insomuch as it either personally bestows the jurisdiction, or it makes, or maintains, or accepts the law by which the jurisdiction is attached to the fulfilment of legal conditions. In either case it is *cum Petro et per Petrum*.

The opinion which would regard the bishops as mere lieutenants or vicars of the Sovereign Pontiff is one which is rejected and discredited not only in the schools of Catholic theology but by the Papacy itself.¹

Thus the bishops, invested with the power of order immediately from Christ, and with that of jurisdiction from His vicar, occupy their thrones throughout the Catholic world as true successors of the Apostles, and in their united phalanx around the Chair of Peter still present to the world the perpetuity of "Peter in the midst of his brethren".

Nor would the texts which are cited do much to help the Anglican reader, who either learns for himself or from others the Catholic doctrine of the Primacy.

Our Lord gave His spiritual power and authority to His

¹ "Although it may be within his (the Pope's) power to limit the jurisdiction of a bishop, the bishop does not on this account become a mere deputy or vicar of the Pope. The bishops now as ever are called *Ordinaries*. . . . As long as the Episcopal office is an essential element in the organism of the Church, which it will be to the end of the world, so long will bishops be no mere Papal vicars" (Cardinal Hergenröther in *Catholic Church and Christian State*, vol. i., 194). So also Leo XIII. in his letter *Ad Anglos*. "Just as it is necessary that the authority of Peter should be perpetuated in the Roman Pontiff, so by the fact that the bishops succeed the Apostles, they inherit their ordinary power, and thus the Episcopal Order necessarily belongs to the essential constitution of the Church. Although they do not receive plenary or universal or supreme authority, *they are not to be looked upon as vicars* of the Roman Pontiff, because they exercise a power really their own, and are most truly called the *ordinary* pastors of the peoples over whom they rule" (*Leonis XIII., Acta*, vol. xvi., p. 197).

Apostles in common, and in so doing He obviously addressed them as one body. The Apostles were thus each empowered, and were (whether directly or "*per Petrum*") commissioned by Christ. Moreover, the commission of *each* extended over the *whole* Church at large. "They were each invested by Christ," says Cardinal Franzelin in his treatise *De Scriptura et Traditione*, "with authority to act as pastors, teachers and guardians of the faith for the Universal Church."

But community is not the same as equality.

A king, addressing the officers of his army on the eve of a campaign, might say: "Go *ye* and fight my battles. I give *you* authority to conquer new countries, and to bind or release their people." Each officer would undoubtedly hold his commission from the king. It would not at all follow that there might not be amongst them one to whom would be given the chief command, and with whom the rest would be called upon to work in that measure of subordination which is a condition of all corporate and combined action.

Our Lord, while commissioning His Apostles, who by their number connoted the Universality of His Church, was careful at the same time to lay His finger pointedly upon one, so as to provide for the no less essential note of its Unity. For as Universality postulates many, so Unity postulates origin from one.

As the personal unit of the Church's structure, Christ singled out St. Peter—"the source of unity, beginning from one," as St. Cyprian beautifully expresses it.

In the Gospel two features mark off St. Peter from the rest of the Apostles.

The first is, that the power of "binding and loosing" which Christ gave to the Apostles collectively, He gives also by a special and individual grant to St. Peter. "To *thee* will I give the keys, and whatsoever *thou* shalt bind shall be bound in Heaven." The second is, that there are certain powers and promises given to St. Peter distinctively and by name, and which are not mentioned in reference to the other Apostles. To him, by name, is given the character of "Rock" or foundation of the Church. To him, by name, is given the charge to feed the Flock—lambs and

sheep, people and pastors. To him, by name, is given the office of "confirming his brethren". For him, by name, is offered Christ's omnipotent prayer that in doing so "his faith shall not fail".

Christ's action as set forth in the Gospels is thus clearly twofold. There is his action towards the Apostles collectively, and there is His action towards St. Peter individually.

Both are equally plain, and it would be the merest trifling with the Sacred text to open our eyes to the one and to close them to the other. No Christian will believe that Christ was wont to do and say things arbitrarily or aimlessly. His act and word which fasten upon St. Peter, making him the special recipient of what the others received only in mass, and again making him the recipient of what the others, as far as the text goes, received not at all, cannot be treated as nugatory or meaningless.

Catholics see in them a Divine and deliberate purpose of the first magnitude—the wisdom of the Redeemer securing the unity of His Church. This purpose obviously defines their purport. They cannot mean less than the bestowal—not of a mere honorary primacy—but of the substantive and controlling powers without which the unity of free agents would be shadowy and ineffective. Wherefore, Our Lord's promises to Peter denote to us a command-in-chief amongst his brethren, which in no way weakens—but on the contrary, by supplying the unifying agency, completes—the Divine Commission and prerogatives conferred on the body of the Apostles.

There was a time when the doctrine of St. Peter's supremacy in all its Catholic fulness and clearness was as plainly present to the conscience of England as it can be to our own at the present day.

It was an English king—Edward II.—who thus eloquently expressed it in a letter to the College of Cardinals in 1314.—

"When Jesus Christ, the Only Begotten Son of God, had consummated the work of our salvation, and was about to return to His Father, in order that He might not leave the Flock which He had bought with His Blood bereft of the

guidance of a Shepherd, he delivered over and entrusted the care of it, by an incommutable ordinance, to Blessed Peter, and in his person to his successors, the Roman Pontiffs, that they might govern it in succession; and willed that the Roman Church, who is the Mother and Mistress of all the faithful, for the time presiding, holding as it were the place of God upon earth, should direct by her salutary teaching the peoples of the said Flock scattered throughout the whole world in the way of Salvation, and show them at all times how it becomes them to behave in the House of God" (Wilkins' *Concilia*, ii., 450).

The whole Flock handed over by Christ to the care of St. Peter.

And in Peter's person, to his successors the Roman Pontiffs.

And that by an "incommutable ordinance".

So that the Roman Church is by Christ's will Mother and Mistress of all the Faithful.

And holds the place of God upon earth.

So that she may direct the Flock over the whole world in the way of Salvation.

Truly, if our fourteenth-century ancestors arose from their graves to-day, our theologians would have but little to teach them in the matter of Romanism.

CHAPTER XLIX.

Winchester as an Object-Lesson of Continuity.

(29TH APRIL, 1893.)

THE first week of April, 1893, witnessed a remarkable Anglican function at Winchester.

On 8th April eight hundred years ago, the monks of Winchester felt the quiet routine of their daily life fluttered by a joyful flitting. They migrated from an old and venerated church, in which they had until then lived and prayed and sung, and took up their residence in their splendid new Minster, the present Cathedral of Winchester.

.

The present occupants of the cathedral differ in certain matters of faith, of discipline, which it is needless to specify, from the monks of Winchester. To the enormous bulk of Christendom, whether in the West or in the East, these differences are vital—so much so that the mere mention of any analogy between the religious life of the old tenants and the new would evoke precisely the same smile of appreciative humour at Moscow as it would at Madrid.

Nevertheless, Anglicanism in such matters is *splendide audax*, and it has kept, and with special solemnity, the eight-hundredth anniversary of the memorable day when the dedication of the Minster was celebrated by the Norman bishops and abbots and monks and clergy of 1093.

1093 is a fairly advanced hour in the day of English Church history. The celebration of such an anniversary would seem to mean nothing less than an attempt to unfurl the flag of Anglican continuity upon the very rampart of the Middle Ages.

.

The signification of the event to an Anglican mind can hardly be better expressed than in the words of *The Church Times* :—

On 8th April, 1093, the Cathedral Church of Winchester was solemnly dedicated, and on Saturday and Sunday last the eight-hundredth anniversary of that great event was commemorated within its walls, portions of which were standing eight centuries ago. The preachers, the Dean of Winchester and the Bishop of Newcastle, could not do otherwise than dwell on one special aspect of the festival, the witness of those venerable walls to the wonderful continuity of the Church in England. "Where," asked the Dean, "would be found a better symbol of the continuity and the corporate life of the Church of England than in the record of eight hundred years during which our countrymen had worshipped there?" No one who has learnt to prize liturgical worship can without emotion remember that the prayers he hears to-day have been heard by myriads of Churchmen of preceding generations not only in England, but in other parts of Christendom. But an event like that of Saturday brings the thought home in a deeply significant and forcible manner, and we may feel certain that the Churchmen of Winchester diocese realised then, as they never realised before, how the ancient liturgy has preserved the faith in their own portion of England, and how deep are the roots which the Church has struck into our national life,

If history could be rewritten and reversed, or if the Reformation could be antedated by five centuries, and if the mediæval bishops and clergy who built and consecrated the Minster in 1093 could be proved to have abjured the Pope and subscribed the Thirty-nine Articles, and to have burnt their Missals and used the Book of Common Prayer, the paragraph in *The Church Times* would hardly require any substantial change in its wording.

No doubt the passage we have quoted does no more than put into words what many conscientious men of our time believe or dearly wish to believe. It is hard for earnest-minded men who have loved the beauty of God's house, who have appreciated the charm of that which is Catholic, and who have felt the winning majesty of that which is ancient and historic, not to strive loyally to project their ideals—if so be it they can—into a system, and into surroundings which time and home, and kin and country, have made personally dear to them.

We know that it may not be. But one may surely well believe that God, who ordereth all things sweetly, and from end to end reacheth mightily, will make use of such pathetic ambitions and ideals as guiding lights to lead men to where all that they loved, even from afar, can alone be found in its true and blessed fulfilment.

To such truth-seekers there could hardly be presented a happier object-lesson of the Ancient English Church than that which they may find for themselves in the annals of Winchester.

Any one of a thousand points on the area of the land would equally well suffice, but as Winchester has been chosen, so we may conveniently accept it as the spot upon which we can test the value of the Dean's claim of continuity.

Such a study is, we take it, the best commentary upon the celebration of the 8th of April.

Winchester and the Kingdom of Wessex can claim what to our mind is a noteworthy and distinctive honour.

It owed its conversion and ecclesiastical foundation to a special mission sent directly from the Pope.

It was evangelised, not by any missionary of Iona, or by any disciple of St. Augustine, but had all for itself St. Birinus, who came straight from the Chair of Peter bearing the commission of St. Peter's successor to work for the faith in England.

St. Bede (*Hist. Ecc.*, iii., 7) chronicles the fact as follows :—

“ At that time (A.D. 635) the West Saxons, formerly called Gewissae, in the reign of Cynegils, embraced the faith of Christ at the preaching of Bishop Birinus, who came into Britain by the advice of Pope Honorius, having promised in his presence that he would sow the seed of the holy faith in the inner parts of the dominions of the English where no other teacher had been before him.”

The *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* tells us that in the year 648 the Minster was built by order of King Kenwalk at Winchester, and “ hallowed in the name of St. Peter”. Two years later St. Birinus, the “Apostle of Wessex,” died, and Bishop Hedda had his remains translated to the great cathedral.

Thus the Church of Winchester was Petrine not only in its dedication, but Roman and Papal in its very foundations.

The crucial issue whether at this epoch the Holy See exercised substantive authority over the English Church may be illustrated by the words of the same Pope Honorius in writing to King Edwy :—

“ We have sent two Palls to the two Metropolitans Honorius and Paulinus, to the intent that when either of them shall be called out of this life the other may, *by this authority of Ours*, substitute another bishop in his place . . .” (St. Bede, ii., 17).

His letter to Honorius, Archbishop of Canterbury, is not less authoritative :—

“ Wherefore pursuant to your request, and to that of the Kings, Our sons, We do by these presents, in the name of St. Peter, Prince of the Apostles, *grant you authority* that when the Divine Grace shall call either of you to Himself, the survivor shall ordain a bishop in the room of him that is deceased. To which effect also, We have sent a Pall to each of you, for celebrating the said Ordination; that, *by the*

authority of Our precept, you make an Ordination acceptable to God" (St. Bede, ii., 18).

If historical evidence means anything, St. Birinus came hither under the Commission of a Pope who had no doubt whatever about his authority over the Primates and bishops in England.

Such Pall-giving, with the express transmission of substantive powers of jurisdiction, seems to us to estop for ever any conscientious mind from accepting the theory that the relations between the Anglo-Saxon Church and the Apostolic See were merely those of the missionary and Mother-Church character.

For instance, could we even conceive the Archbishop of Canterbury sending a pall "from the body of St. Augustine" to the Anglican Bishop of New York, to enable him "by this authority of ours" to consecrate the new bishop in Boston?

If such a claim were urged, it would need no great power of imagination mentally to reproduce the nervous diffidence, the timid persuasiveness, the flowing periods in which the operative clauses would be masked in Scriptural references and historical allusions, and sublime generalities.

But it would require no imagination at all to picture the naked and terrible American plainness of the answer that would come back across the Atlantic.

The mere whisper of such a claim would suffice to arouse American Anglicanism into an attitude which would make the repetition of the attempt for ever impossible.

What is so wildly impracticable for the Archbishop of Canterbury in regard to his missionary offshoots outside the British Empire, was both possible and practicable, natural and normal, for Pope Honorius over kingdoms that yielded no civil allegiance to Rome or to Cæsar.

He exercised "this authority of ours" over the Church in England and through St. Birinus in the very foundation of Winchester.¹

¹ That such was the constant tradition, and the undoubted conviction of the Winchester Church itself—"our countrymen" of the "eight hundred years" to whom the Dean appeals as witnesses of Anglican continuity—is written large in the *Greater History of Winchester*, com-

The present clergy of the cathedral hold their positions by signing the formula that the Pope "hath no jurisdiction in this realm of England".

Is this organic contrast, by which one set of men accept and hold what the other rejects and repudiates, the "symbol of continuity" to which the Dean alludes in his sermon?

Winchester has the imperishable glory of being the starting-point from which began the apostolate of St. Boniface and the conversion of Germany.

From a monastery near Winchester, in A.D. 718, Winfrid or Boniface set out for Rome, armed with a commendatory letter from Daniel, the venerable bishop of the diocese, who, three years later, himself went to visit the Holy Father. Pope Gregory II. commissioned the English monk to go forth on his task of converting the German tribes "in the name of the Indivisible Trinity, by the inviolable authority of Blessed Peter, Prince of the Apostles, with the dispensation of whose doctrinal teaching we are charged, and the place of whose sacred see we administer".¹

Never was a mission more distinctively Papal (or ought we to say Italian?) than that of the Winchester missionary.

The Pope invested Boniface with the Pallium, and made him his "Legate of the Apostolic See". And in return Boniface took an oath of obedience to the Pope. He stamped the imprint of his own Romanism upon the face of the German Church.

posed by Thomas Rudborne, the monk of Winchester, in the latter half of the fifteenth century. This writer cites Archbishop Theodore (A.D. 679) as saying: "It is not our will, and it would ill-become us, during the lifetime of our most holy brother Hedda, to injure his diocese in any way by diminishing it; seeing that he so splendidly ennobled the Church of Winchester, by transferring, by the authority of Pope Agatho, the body of the most Blessed Birinus, Apostle of the West Saxons, from the city of Dorchester, where it was kept, and at the same time with it the See, to the city of Winchester; and by whose labour and zeal the seat of Episcopal dignity was, by the Apostolic mandate, then for the first time confirmed to the same city" (*Anglia Sacra*, i., 193).

¹"Ideo in nomine Indivisibilis Trinitatis, per inconcussam auctoritatem beati Petri, Apostolorum principis, cuius doctrinae magisteriis dispensatione fungimur et locum sacrae sedis administramus, modestiam tuae religionis instituimus" (Letter of Pope Gregory II. to St. Boniface; Haddan and Stubbs, *Ecc. Councils*, iii., 363).

Writing to Cuthbert, Archbishop of Canterbury, a report of his work, and of the proceedings of a council of bishops which he had held at Frankfort (appended to the Acts of the English Council of Cloveshoe, A.D. 747), St. Boniface says :—

“In our Synod we have decreed and professed,

“1. To hold while life shall last the Catholic faith, and unity, and subjection to the Roman Church.

“2. To be subject to Blessed Peter and to his successor.

“3. To hold Synods once a year.

“4. The metropolitan bishops to seek their Palls from that see.

“5. To seek to follow canonically in all things the precepts of St. Peter, that we may be counted amongst the sheep entrusted to his care.

“And to this profession we have all agreed and subscribed, and we have sent it to the Tomb of St. Peter, Prince of the Apostles. And the Roman clergy and Pontiff have joyfully received it” (Haddan and Stubbs, *Ecc. Councils*, iii., 377).

Othlonus, the biographer of St. Boniface, who wrote about the beginning of the twelfth century, professes to give the words of this oath :—

“I, Boniface, by God’s grace Bishop, do promise to thee Blessed Peter, Prince of the Apostles, and to thy Vicar, Blessed Pope Gregory, and to his successors, by the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost, the Indivisible Trinity, and by this Thy most sacred Body, to observe all fealty and the purity of the Holy Catholic faith ; to remain, God helping, in the unity of the same faith ; in which, without doubt, every Christian must seek salvation ; never to consent at the persuasion of any one, to anything contrary to the unity of the common and Universal Church, but, as I have said, to show in all things my faith, purity and helpfulness to thee, and to the interests of thy Church to which was given by the Lord the power of binding and loosing, and to thy Vicar and to his successors. And if I shall find bishops acting against the ancient laws of the holy fathers, I will have no communion or converse with them. But rather, if it shall

be in my power to hinder them, I will do so ; if not, I will faithfully and immediately denounce them to my lord the Pope.

“And if—which God forbid—I should ever attempt to do anything against the tenor of this promise, by any manner, device or occasion whatsoever, may I fall under the guilt of eternal judgment, may I incur the punishment of Ananias and Sapphira, who dared to practise a fraud upon you, even as to things which were their own.

“The written form of this oath, I, Boniface, unworthy Bishop, have written with my own hand, and I have laid it on the most sacred Body of St. Peter, so that as prescribed, I have, God being my Witness and my Judge, made an oath, which I promise to fulfil” (see *Acta Sanctorum*, tom. xxi., 462).

Now, here we hold in our right hand the subscription of Winchester’s greatest saint and missionary.

And here we hold in our left that other subscription of the Thirty-nine Articles which the present Dean and clergy of Winchester have signed, repudiating obedience or subjection to the Pope.

Is it in the relation of the diametrical antagonism which exists between the one and the other that the Dean discovers the symbol of continuity?

Amongst the dales of Derbyshire stands Chatsworth, one of the stateliest of the stately homes of England.

Minds possessed by a sense of historic values are wont to regard the palatial fabric as the fitting frame of its noble library, just as they look upon the library as the worthy casket of its priceless treasure—the old Anglo-Saxon Service Book, known as the *Benedictional of St. Ethelwold*.

The fortunate feature of this venerable volume is that it is profusely illustrated. Side by side are pictures and prayers. The pictures are of saints, of priests, of vestments, of acolytes with censers. The prayers are blessings, formulas used by the bishop for the various festivals throughout the year.

We have but to turn over its leaves, and there passes before us a panorama of the faith and worship of the Anglo-Saxon Church.

There are the blessing-prayers to be used on the Feast of the Annunciation. And there opposite is the fair figure of Our Lady, robed in jewelled attire, enthroned under a canopy, while the angel stands by to declare his message.

The inscription runs:—

“*Here standeth the Heavenly Messenger proclaiming to Mary, ‘Behold, O Blessed One, thou wilt bring forth Him who is both God and Man’.*”¹

Here is the prayer for Candlemas day:—

“O Lord Jesus Christ, Creator of Heaven and Earth, King of Kings and Lord of Lords, listen to Thy unworthy servants crying and praying to Thee. We beseech Thee, Lord Almighty, and Eternal God, who didst create all things from nothing, and by Thy command through the work of the bee didst make to come forth this wax or moisture, and who on this day didst hear the prayer of the just Symeon, we humbly beseech Thee, that Thou wilt deign to bless and sanctify these candles for the use of men whether on land or on sea, by the invocation of Thy most Holy Name, and by the intercession of Holy Mary, Thy Mother, whose feast we keep to-day, and by the prayers of all Saints, so that while this Thy people bear them with honour in their hands, and sing Thy praise, Thou mayest hear their voice from Holy Heaven and the throne of Thy Majesty, and may be merciful to all who cry to Thee, and whom Thou hast redeemed by Thy precious Blood, who livest and reignest with the Father and the Holy Ghost, God, world without end.”

Here is the prayer for the Feast of St. Peter’s Chair:—

“O God, who madest Blessed Peter the Apostle in such a way to be the chief, that amongst the very Princes of the Faith he obtained the Primacy (*principatum*), and having received the princely power on earth was made the door-keeper of Heaven, so that he might admit whom he would as citizens of the kingdom, look down upon Thy people with Thy wonted mercy, who didst uphold the footsteps of Thy most holy Apostle upon the sea, and didst wash away his sins in his tears, so that through his intercession and

¹ A transcript of the Benedictional with plates of illustrations by John Gage may be seen in vol. xxiv. of the *Archæologia*.

award he may by pardon lead the flocks committed to his care where he himself, both shepherd and door-keeper, recompensed by Thee, rejoices in glory."

St. Ethelwold, who used this Benedictional, was Bishop of Winchester—the same who melted down the church plate to buy bread for his starving flock.

He found in his cathedral certain canons who were sufficiently relaxed to think that in defiance of the laws of the Church they might serve God more easily in the married state than in the celibacy of the secular or monastic clergy, and so possess Christ's hundredfold reward and "wife and lands" at the same time.

The good Bishop who was so tender to the starving poor had no pity to waste on these domesticated clerics. His action, as Eadmer¹ tells, was prompt and practical. One day, when the choir was singing the Communion verse of the Mass, "*Servite Domino*" ("Serve ye the Lord with fear, and rejoice unto Him with trembling. Embrace discipline lest at any time the Lord be angry, and ye perish from the just way"—Ps. ii. 11), the Bishop suddenly entered the cathedral, carrying a portentous bundle under his arm.

"Have you been paying attention to what you have just been singing?" he inquired of the canons.

"We have," was the tremulous answer.

"Then," said the Bishop, "if you wish to serve the Lord with fear, and to rejoice to Him with trembling, *embrace discipline*, that is to say, the monastic habit."

Whereupon he unrolled his bundle before the eyes of the astonished canons. It was found to contain several sets of monastic habits or cowls. These ominously corresponded to the exact number of the canons. St. Ethelwold, with his supply of monastic clothing before him, then and there gave his canons their choice of two alternatives—either to put on the cowls and embrace the monastic life, and live up to the requirements of their sacred state, or else to clear out of his cathedral. "Either straight away you accept this discipline, or in this very instant you will be swept out from

¹ Eadmer's *Vita Sti. Dunstani, Anglia Sacra*, ii., 219.

the livings and corporate life of this place." Clerical celibacy or the door! ¹

St. Ethelwold's "*jam jamque*" meant no further trifling.

The effect was worth whole years of ecclesiastical process or preaching.

The right minded were promptly clothed, and "served the Lord with fear". The recalcitrant betook themselves elsewhere, and St. Ethelwold filled up their places with monks from the Abbey of Abingdon.

We have here St. Ethelwold as the exponent of Anglo-Saxon Church worship and of clerical celibacy.

One is tempted to ask on which of these points—the intercession and invocation of the Saints, or clerical vows of celibacy—would the Dean of Winchester or his clergy like to found their claim to continuity?

Would he take St. Ethelwold's prayers with their Petrine and intercessory doctrines? Would he take St. Ethelwold's monastic habit with its corresponding obligations?

Putting the cowl aside as out of the question, we may ask, would he care to make public use of that prayer about the candles in Winchester Cathedral on the 2nd of next February?

And if continuity be not in the principle of Supreme Church Authority—and if it be not in the principles of faith and worship—and if it be not in the standard of Church life and discipline—is it really worth while asking where else it may or can be?

What can it avail any Church to possess a mere tenant-continuity?

To worship inside the same walls, the same Christ with the same official grades of ministry cannot be a continuity worth claiming, for all this and more might have existed just as truly in the Anglican Church had the Tudor sovereigns forced her to be Monophysite, Nestorian, or even Arian.

But all this Winchester Catholicism, of which we have but faintly traced the outline, belongs to a stage of our Church history when the Dean's period of "eight hundred years" had not even yet begun.

¹"Sed aut disciplinam in praesenti apprehendetis aut loci istius beneficiis et conversationi hinc eliminati jam jamque cedetis."

In the next chapter we may be allowed to seek for the "Symbol of Continuity" in the corporate life of the centuries which followed.

In Anglo-Saxon Winchester we find not continuity but contrast. There can never be continuity between Yes and No—between the Yes of SS. Birinus, Boniface and Ethelwold, and the No of the Anglican Prayer-book and the Thirty-nine Articles.

CHAPTER L.

Winchester, a Lantern Lecture.

(13TH MAY, 1893.)

THE wider the mirror, the fuller the reflection.

Winchester in Norman times took rank as a royal city. Kings dwelt, and Courts resided, and Councils of the realm were held within its walls. Windsor and Winchester were, in fact, the two *foci* around which the majestic sweep of Norman royalty revolved.

Thus the features of Anglican continuity, which might be excusably dim in the old and simple Saxon city, could hardly help being revealed, if they were to be revealed at all, in the fuller and fiercer light which beat upon Winchester as a centre of royal action and national life in the years which followed the Conquest.

The Dean of Winchester himself encourages us to this quest when he appeals to the Church history of Winchester and its cathedral as the witness of Anglican continuity.

We look at the record.

Our task is to "find the continuity".

We take the 800 years. That is to say, we traverse the span from the year 1093 to the recent Anglican celebration and the preaching of the Dean's sermon. But we beg for a short twenty-three years' preface to make room for an event which riveted upon Winchester the eyes of all England in the fourth year after the Conquest.

The drama of Winchester's annals can hardly be sketched in the compass of these pages, save in a series of scenes.

Suppose, then, that we have a Lantern Lecture.

We are in a public hall. The gas is lowered, until the lime-light disc glows upon a screen which hangs in front of the platform.

The first slide that we cast upon its surface is Winchester in 1070.

An assembly of Church and State.

Bishops and abbots are mingled with knights and barons. In the centre of the group stand four famous figures. The stout strongly built man, whose stern face seems hardly less iron-cast than the helmet above it, is William the Conqueror.

The three ecclesiastics at his side are Ermenfrid, and the Cardinals John and Peter, all three Legates of Pope Alexander II., who have arrived from Rome.

They have come to put the English Church in order. They begin at the top. They are about to exercise one of the most stupendous acts of Apostolic jurisdiction—one which happily was never needed but twice in the whole course of English history—the deposition and degradation of an Archbishop of Canterbury. Stigand, Archbishop of Canterbury, has proved himself a schismatic and a rebel to the Pope. He has usurped the Pallium, which he sought and obtained at the hands of an antipope.

Pope Alexander II. has sent his Legates with a demand that Stigand shall be deposed and degraded, and that an absolutely clean clearance shall be made of all prelates whom he has consecrated.¹

Here, in this very Council, the sentence of degradation and deposition is pronounced by the Legates in the presence of the King. The Archbishop and his brother, the Bishop of Elmham, and all who have resisted what the Thirty-nine Articles describe as the Pope's "jurisdiction in this realm," are rooted out as weeds from the Church of England.

We find that practically the whole work of the reorganisation of the Church in this country—a reorganisation so complete that only the occupants of two sees in the whole

¹ Remigius, in his profession of obedience to Lanfranc, mentions the mission of the Legates from the Pope with orders that all who had been ordained by Stigand should be deposed or suspended (Stubbs' *Constitutional History*, i., 306 n.).

kingdom were left unchanged—is carried out under the direction of the Roman Authority exercised by these Legates.

We gaze upon this great and solemn national act at Winchester, in which the hand of St. Peter is laid so heavily and wholesomely upon the English Church.

Then we look upon that other assembly of men that met last month, holding in their hands the Book of Common Prayer with its enclosure of the Articles.

Is it herein—between the *inclusion* and the *exclusion*—between the *recognition* and the *repudiation* of the Supreme Church Authority—that we are to find the Dean's continuity?

But perhaps the Winchester Council of 1070 is rather a Royal than a Papal one? And possibly was it called rather by the King's than the Pope's Authority?

Let us put the question to the Legates and the Bishops there standing around the altar.

For reply, they hand us the writ or summons, in virtue of which they are assembled.

We cast it on the screen, and it reads as follows:—

“Although the Roman Church has the duty of seeing to the correction of all Christians, nevertheless, more especially does it belong to her to inquire into the morals of your conduct, and by the diligence of her Visitation, to repair amongst you the Christian Religion in which she of old instructed you.

“With a view to fulfil this debt of solicitude, We, the unworthy (*qualescumque*) ministers of Blessed Peter the Apostle, and taking the place of, and armed with the authority of our lord Pope Alexander, have come to your shores, to hold a Council with you, so that we may pull up whatever has evilly grown up in the Vineyard of the Lord of Hosts, and plant whatever will be for the benefit of souls and bodies.

“By Apostolic Authority we, therefore, invite your brothership to share in so great a solicitude, and to meet together at Winchester on the third day after next Easter—all excuse put aside—and you will warn all the Abbots of your diocese to accompany you, showing to them these our letters.”¹

¹ Wilkins' *Concilia*, vol. i., 323,

Between a Council called together at Winchester by Papal authority, to enforce a Papal mandate of the first magnitude, and an assembly of clergymen also met together in Winchester, whose very position and work are based on a rejection of Papal Authority, there is a relation.

But it is not that of continuity.

Another scene.

The inside of the old cathedral at Winchester.

It is Whitsunday of the same eventful year, 1070.

On a throne on the sanctuary, mitred and vested, sits Ermenfrid, the Pope's Legate.

Bishops, abbots, priests and monks form a circle around him.

The priest kneeling at the feet of the Legate is Walkelyn, the King's Chaplain.

The Papal Legate is consecrating him Bishop of Winchester.

The High Mass, with the stately ceremony of the consecration, is over, and the bells are ringing, and the *Te Deum* is swelling through the minster in joy and thanksgiving for the new pastor that the Apostolic See has given to Winchester.

We shall see him again.

Another joyful ceremony.

It is an April day of 1093 (the one of which the Anglican occupants of Winchester Cathedral have recently kept the 800th anniversary).

This time the old surroundings have passed away, and wondering and admiring crowds are surging between the mighty walls and under the lofty roof of the new Cathedral.

The flower of the English Church and State have come to the hallowing.

The old Wintonian chronicler's heart swells with the patriotism of his place as he puts it on record that "almost every Bishop and Abbot in England" is there, and that they have come "with exceeding gladness and glory"—*maximâ exultatione et gloria*¹—to consecrate the stately fabric that

¹ *Annales Ecclesiae Wintoniensis, Anglia Sacra*, i., 239.

Winchester has raised to the honour of God and of St. Peter and St. Swithin.

The consecrating Bishop is Walkelyn, whom last we saw at the feet of the Papal legate. The new minster is Walkelyn's work, and a shadow flits across his face as he thinks of his next meeting with the Red King, for he remembers how in his unsparing zeal he, the Bishop, has swept out of existence a whole royal forest to accomplish it. As he passes from the chancel, and traces with his pastoral crook the mystic alphabets to the God of All Knowledge athwart the spacious nave, he well may feel with holy pride that few of the mitred prelates at his side will return to their homes throughout the land to find a nobler temple or a lovelier shrine than he and they have blessed this day at Winchester.

How great would have been Walkelyn's surprise and horror if some prophetic angel could have bent down and delivered to those assembled the dread message of the future:—

“Eight hundred years from to-day, another ceremony will take place within these walls which you have built, and here on this spot which you have hallowed, men who have renounced the authority of the Apostolic See will meet to celebrate a service specially framed to take the place of the Mass by those who will have rejected the Propitiatory Sacrifice of the Altar as ‘damnable idolatry’. To you the Mass is essentially a *Sacrifice*, and its very meaning and merit is that thereby the blessedness of the Sacrifice of Calvary is imported into your worship, and brought home to your altars at all times and all places. To you it is that or nothing. To you the Sacrifice is the very *soul* of your service. But those who will meet here on this day eight centuries to come, will keep the commemoration with a service in which the very idea of propitiatory Sacrifice will have been purposely abjured, and the very word will have been utterly blotted out and banished from its liturgy.”

And this to Walkelyn!

Walkelyn, who was consecrated by the hands of the

Pope's own legate! Walkelyn, who is even now going up to the high altar to celebrate the "damnable idolatry"!

Can the Dean of Winchester even picture to himself the wrath and consternation with which such an announcement would be received in such an assembly?

There are mailed hands down there in the nave that would have gone swiftly to the hilts of their weapons at the mere mention of such a catastrophe. The pastoral staves in the sanctuary would have trembled and shaken like pines under the north wind in anger and abhorrence at the mere thought of such an apostasy!

Hardly would those sturdy barons find in their fierce Norman tongue oaths sufficiently strong, and hardly would those bishops find in their Pontificals anathemas sufficiently blighting and bitter wherewith to denounce what they would have called, in those days of unmincing speech, a "heretical pollution".

They would probably have applied to such a commemoration the same straightforward adjective which the Reformers prefixed to our "idolatry".

But who could depict the speechless bewilderment that would have fallen upon the throng if the barons were suddenly asked to stay their hand, and the bishops were besought to stay their ban, on the ground that between themselves—sons and sworn defenders of Holy Church as they were—and the future abjurers of the Pope and the Mass there was, after all, nothing but historic harmony and Catholic continuity!

We may doubt if the sense of humour in the eleventh century would have risen to the occasion. Norman bishops and barons were not by any means safe people to jest with, and truly the Dean of Winchester may congratulate himself that he had eight whole centuries between himself and those with whose work he was claiming continuity.

Had his sermon been delivered to *them*, and had they but had as much as a hint of its meaning, it would have required a whole bodyguard of angels to have saved the minster from the need of a further ceremony of reconciliation.

There yet remain a few slides upon our list, and turning away from that uncompromisingly Catholic and Papal assembly that met at the hallowing of the minster in 1093, we may be allowed to seek farther on in the life of Winchester for some trace of the Dean's symbol.

In the meantime we can only remember that the sainted dead are without anger. We cannot doubt that many of the good bishops and monks and faithful laymen, whose dust awaits the resurrection beneath the floor of Winchester Cathedral, will have watched with prayerful emotion the recent assembly held within its walls.

What is "bound" on earth "shall be bound in heaven," and it is not for the Church in heaven to bless what the Church of Christ upon the earth has banned. But they in the light of God's countenance will surely have seen there—what even our feeble charity here on earth fails not to see—a generation which in all sincerity is seeking the face of God according to its light.

And surely at least will they have blessed—and we may join them in blessing—that yearning cry of earnest souls, heartsick of the selfishness of the Reformation, seeking so pitifully where it is not to be found, the beauty and peace of what is ancient and beautiful, sacred and true, traditional and Catholic.

CHAPTER LI.

The Winchester Priors.

(10TH JUNE, 1893.)

WE cast upon our lantern screen the figure of a stately prelate vested in cope and mitre. On his finger gleams a richly jewelled ring, and on his hands are the ceremonial gloves.

A very type of the grand ecclesiastic of the Middle Ages.

Of what see is he the bishop?

He is not a bishop.

An abbot?

Not even an abbot.

But he wears a mitre?

Evidently.

And a ring?

Undoubtedly.

Yet he is only a prior—the Prior of St. Swithun's, at Winchester.

Then whence all this glory of episcopal insignia?

It is the privilege of his monastery. Rome has sealed the light of her favour upon St. Swithun's, and its priors, mitred, gloved and ringed, and sandaled, walk side by side with the bishops and abbots of the land.

It happened in the days of King Henry III.

The See of Winchester was a much-coveted post.

When it became vacant in 1250, King Henry III. besought the monks to choose his brother—Ethelmar or Aymer de Lusignan.

Aymer was then a young man in minor orders, and only in his twenty-third year.

The monks were willing to overlook his youthfulness, and duly elected him to the See.

The Pope, in spite of strong opposition from the barons of England, who loved not Aymer, confirmed the election, but withheld consecration for ten years, so that the candidate had ample time to arrive at the age of episcopal discretion.

Thus Winchester was for ten years under the rule of a Bishop-elect.

Royal Winchester was privileged to witness within its walls more of State pageants and Church processions than almost any other city of England, and yet even in the long red-letter list of its memories few could have excelled the splendour of that day in July, 1251, when Aymer, the young Bishop-elect, was received by the whole city in solemn procession, and King Henry III., with all his Court, was there in person to bid him welcome.

But when the festivities were over, and the normal round of Church life resumed its course, Aymer—possibly for want of the discretion for which the Church was waiting—found time to quarrel with the monks.

His ways were hard, and his hand was heavy upon them.

It was all about certain disputed claims upon a piece of

Church property. But fighting one who was a Bishop-elect and the King's brother to boot was uphill work for the monastery.

The King himself offered to intervene and negotiate a settlement. But the monks—and very naturally—had reasons of their own for thinking that the position would not be improved by an arbitration of which the impartiality was more than doubtful.

Besides, they knew of a better way, especially in a case where kings or kings' brothers were concerned.

“Our Lord the King,” says the old chronicler, “wished to make peace between Aymer, the Bishop-elect, and the monks of Winchester. But the convent looked forward to better terms which could be obtained from our Lord the Pope. And so they refused the offer, and they were not mistaken” (*Annales Wintoniensis*, Anno MCCLV.).

So William of Taunton, the prior, betook himself to Rome. Terms were arranged which the Pope confirmed, and Aymer and the monks were once more started in the beautiful ways of peace.

But a long residence at Rome had endeared the Prior William to Pope Innocent IV. In their intercourse the Holy Father had learned the tale—which, no doubt, had not lost from want of sympathetic telling—of the trials of the monastery at Winchester and how much it had suffered in many ways by the youthful zeal of the Bishop-elect.

As a compensation, and to show that Rome was not unmindful of its duty to show publicly its sympathy with the oppressed—even when kinsmen of kings were the oppressors—the Pope granted to Prior William, and to his successors in St. Swithun's, the right to wear the dalmatic, the mitre, the ring and the sandals¹ (*Annales Wintoniensis Anglia Sacra*, i., 310).

Thus it was the hand of St. Peter to whom they turned for help in the hour of sorrow and need, that clothed for all future time the priors of Winchester with these highest insignia of ecclesiastical distinction, and marked them out

¹ The grant is mentioned in the *Calendar of Papal Letters*, vol. i., p. 305.

as specially honoured and favoured amongst the priors of England.

One may wonder what any of these priors, whose very dress was a constant reminder of what Winchester owed to Rome, would have said, could they have listened to the Dean's recent sermon on Continuity.

Would they not have pointed to their mitres, and held up their gloved hands and their ringed fingers, and shaken their croziers, and have demanded of the preacher to tell them what in the name of English honesty did all these things mean if the successor of St. Peter "hath not any jurisdiction in this realm of England"?

CHAPTER LII.

A Winchester Bishop—William of Wykeham.

(24TH JUNE, 1893.)

THE fairest, fullest and brightest page of Winchester Catholicism is that which bears the venerated name of William of Wykeham.

In the olden time the parish priest was the "person" or living embodiment of the parish, and the bishop was the "person" of the diocese, and the Pope, as Archbishop Peckham tells us, was the "Person of the Apostolic See".

In a historical, as well as in an ecclesiastical sense, William of Wykeham will remain for all time the person of Winchester. His name is inseparably wedded to the place. The traditions of the place are welded with his fame.

No educated Englishman now or in the future can ever pronounce the word Winchester without thinking of William of Wykeham.

Who was he?

We turn to our lantern and screen to answer the question.

The scene before us is the Lady Chapel of the minster at Winchester.

The altar lights are mirrored and multiplied in the sur-

roundings of silver adornment, and the very table of the altar itself is of silver and gilt.¹

The priest with the shaven crown and the long flowing chasuble is the monk called Pekys, who comes to this chapel daily to say the Mass. For here is said the Mass of our Blessed Lady—the “Mary Mass” of the day.

The poor peasant youth who kneels close by, devoutly hearing the Mass—dreaming perhaps of a day when he too may be privileged to say it—is called William Longe, or simply William. Just now one name is thought to be enough for such as he. Later on, when he becomes sufficiently important to need two names, they will call him William of Wykeham, from the village in which he is said to have been born.

He comes here faithfully each day to assist at the Holy Sacrifice, and to pray with the priest in the words of the old Sarum Missal, “that we who truly believe her to be the Mother of God, may with Thee be assisted by her prayers, through Christ our Lord”.

Devotion to the Mass (which is devotion to Christ as our High Priest and Victim) and devout invocation of the Mother of God, are the two most genuine marks of the traditional English, as of every other Catholic.

We have before us another altar, with its towering cross and glistening lights. In front of it seated on a throne or faldstool is William Edington, Bishop of Winchester.

At the vacancy of the see in 1345, the King wrote in his favour to the Pope, and the Holy Father, wishing to gratify his “most excellent son, the King of England,” set aside a candidate whom the monks had elected, and by Bulls of Provision, *ex plenitudine Apostolicæ potestatis*, appointed William Edington to the See of Winchester. The Papal license for his consecration with the copy of the Oath of Fealty to the Pope, to be signed and returned to the Roman Chancery, was issued in February, 1346 (*Calendar of Papal Letters*, vol. iii., p. 26).

¹ Inventory of Winchester Church Goods in vol. i., Dugdale, *Monasticon*.

And the gratified King upon his side has made the new bishop a prelate of the Order of the Garter, which he has just founded "in honour of the Blessed Virgin and out of his singular affection for her," and has further ordained that the grant shall descend to his successors, the Bishops of Winchester.

Nor were the honours ill bestowed.

Holding one of the wealthiest sees of England, Bishop Edington comes down to us as one who, much too kind-hearted to wait or make others wait for the hour of his will-making, emptied himself during his life-time of all his worldly goods, and distributed what he possessed into the hands of Christ's poor.¹

Before this good Bishop kneels the youth William, now a cleric, well taught in the sacred learning of the time.

He holds forth his hands for the priestly consecration, and on the outstretched palms the Bishop traces the cross of the sacred anointing, while he says in Latin:—

"O Lord, deign to consecrate and to sanctify these hands by this anointing and Thy blessing, that whatsoever they shall consecrate may be consecrated, and whatsoever they shall bless may be blessed and hallowed in the name of Our Lord Jesus Christ."

Then the Bishop puts into William's hands, thus sanctified and consecrated, the chalice with wine and the paten with a host, and says "with a slow voice" the words which make more full and explicit the form of priestly ordination:—

"Receive the power to offer sacrifice to God, and to celebrate the Mass both for the living and the dead, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ."

Such is the formula in the ancient Winchester Pontifical, used for centuries at the minster—such, too, is the formula used in our ordinations to-day.

(But such is *not* the formula—nor is such the intention and belief—according to which the present Bishop of Winchester either ordains or was ordained.)

This ordering of the clergy which was carried out for centuries in the sanctuary of the minster is the most vital

¹ He had already given £1,000 to the hospital of St. Cross.

function of church life. It is there, in the very flow of Apostolic power and ministry, that we find between the new and the old tenants of the Cathedral, not "continuity," but a chasm which is as broad and as deep as the Reformers, with their ordinal framed to express their vehement denial of the Sacrificial Priesthood of the new law, could dig it.

Another scene. A room in the Royal Palace.

Seated at the table we see England's mighty ruler, King Edward III.

Around him are his courtiers and councillors.

The table is covered with plans and drawings of castles and churches.

At his right hand stands William, now even higher in the Royal favour than his bishop and patron, William Edington of Winchester.

His genius for mathematics has procured for him the post of the King's chief surveyor in the construction of the buildings and public works of the realm.

His statesmanlike prudence has won for him the confidence of the King, who has made him Lord Keeper of the Privy Seal. Ecclesiastical preferments have been showered upon him, and immense revenues pour into his hands, only to be poured forth again for the public weal.

And so it has come to pass that the peasant boy who heard Mass in the Lady Chapel at Winchester takes his stand with the princes of his people in the courts of kings.

We have before us the High Altar of the old Cathedral of St. Paul's.

It is Sunday, the 10th of October, in 1367.

On the Altar we see the lights burning in the ponderous silver candelabra which flank the cross. Before it we note "a beautiful silken frontal richly embroidered with flowers and golden crowns," and having "in the centre the figure of the Blessed Virgin Mary seated, with our Saviour and the Blessed Trinity, all in silver upon golden thrones".¹

¹ See Inventory of Church Goods of St. Paul's, A.D. 1245 and 1402, vol. 1., *Archæologia*.

The prelate, seated upon a throne in the sanctuary, and wearing the "mitre encrusted with pearls and precious stones,"¹ is the primate, Archbishop (a short time after Cardinal) Langham, whom the Pope has translated hither from Ely.

At his feet kneels William of Wykeham to receive episcopal consecration.

They read the Bull of Provision by which Pope Urban V. has appointed him to the See of Winchester (*Anglia Sacra*, i., 317).

We hear the authoritative words of the operative clause of the Bull—the echo in England of the Papal sentence pronounced in Consistory:—

"All of which things having duly weighed and considered, We, with the advice of Our said brethren, and by Apostolic Authority, have Provided for the said Church of Winchester in the person of the said William, acceptable to Us and to Our brethren by the claim of his afore-mentioned merits, and We have appointed him thereto as its Bishop and Pastor, fully committing to him the care and administration of the same, both in spirituals and temporals."

The head and hands of William of Wykeham are anointed with chrism. The pastoral staff is blessed and placed in his hands. The episcopal ring is blessed and placed on his finger. It symbolises the fact that he is wedded to his Spouse, the Church of Winchester. The mitre is blessed and placed upon his head. The Book of the Gospels is placed in his hands. Then the newly consecrated Bishop bends lowly to his metropolitan and consecrator and betakes himself to a side chapel, where, according to the rubric of the Sarum Pontifical, he celebrates the Mass of Our Blessed Lady.

Two stately buildings. One at Oxford, the other at Winchester.

William of Wykeham has happily brought to his see his genius and zeal for construction. And, more happily still,

¹ See Inventory of Church Goods of St. Paul's, A.D. 1245 and 1402, vol. I., *Archæologia*.

the chiefest work which he has begun to build up is the education of his diocese. His is not the ideal that education can be cramped into the narrowness of mere diocesan machinery. He knows that education to be preparatory must begin there, but he knows also that, to be adequate and complete, it must not end there. Rather must it go forth and expand its lungs upon the broad field of a national basis.

He has therefore resolved to found two great colleges, each of which shall be the complementary of the other.

One is to meet the local need at Winchester and one is to be founded at Oxford, which the first shall feed and to which it shall lead up, and whither his best clerks shall go, to share in the intellectual light and life of the great Catholic and national Alma Mater and thence return to shed it upon his diocese.

This double institution so wisely planned and so munificently carried out is the chief glory of Wykeham, just as Wykeham is the chief glory of Winchester.

May we not, then, feel that we are very much at the heart of historic Winchester if we enter for a moment into its famous school and see for ourselves the method and manner in which it was founded.

Here, if anywhere, we ought to discover some trace of the Dean's "record of continuity".

CHAPTER LIII.

A Winchester School Chapel.

(8TH JULY, 1893.)

ONE more scene upon our screen.

The Chapel of Winchester College in the year 1525.

The scene has in it something of the pathos which belongs to last days. It might be called, indeed, one of the closing years of the *pax Catholica* which had rested upon the land for nearly a thousand years. But a short time later, and Henry VIII. began to feel the anguish of his troubled conscience, and then matters moved speedily as they neared the end.

But here, in 1525, we are still in the light of the Catholic

day; the terrible to-morrow has not yet come, and before us we have an English College Chapel, just as it stood on the eve of the Reformation. It will be for us not only to take in the general view, but to examine the picture somewhat in detail. It is a duty to be painstaking when we are in search of the Dean's "record of continuity".

There upon the high altar stands "the Tabernacle of gold" encrusted "with precious stones and pearls," and adorned with "ymages of the Holy Trinity and the Blessed Virgin in crystal".¹ It is the truly royal gift of King Henry VI. to the College of Winchester.

On either side stand "the silver candlesticks," "gilt," "wreathed" and embossed, averaging in weight about two pounds each.

Above them towers the lofty silver-gilt "crucifix," bearing "the Founder's arms," and weighing more than thirteen pounds.

Images!

Look around.

Here is the "Silver Ymage of the Blessed Virgin and Child seated". It is said to have been the gift of the great Cardinal Beaufort—"the Cardinal of England," as they proudly used to style him. It is nearly a stone weight of solid silver.

There, too—within two ounces of the same weight—are "Two Ymages of the Blessed Virgin and the Archangel Gabriel supporting a silver-gilt bowl with a lily and Crucifix".

Here, weighing 142 ounces of silver, is "a great Tabernacle, with Ymages of the Blessed Virgin and Child, and an angel on either side holding a candlestick in his hands, and an ymage of St. Paul above".

There on one side is a smaller "Silver-gilt Ymage of the Blessed Virgin and Child standing". The silver-gilt image of the Saint on the other side represents "St Swithun," one of the patrons of Winchester.

¹Summary of Contents of the Vestuary in the year 1525, given in the *Annals of Winchester College*, by T. F. Kirby, M.A., p. 230, in which also all the objects which follow may be found,

Then, how eloquently Catholic is the adornment of the Sanctuary!

As we look upon it, we seem to see the lights gleam upon the altar, and to witness once again the glorious movement of the High Mass.

Right before us, the altar wears the frontal "of white damask worked with golden roses, and green and yellow-green branches in silk".

It has "the Crucifix in the middle, the Virgin Mary, St. John and the Nativity" on the left side. On the opposite side is the triumphant scene of our Lord rising from the Tomb. In the centre is the Angel Gabriel saluting the Mother of God as Blessed amongst Women.

It hangs there in the central point of the church, as a small Catechism teaching graphically as only the things of sight can teach the great triptych of Christian truths—the Incarnation, the Redemption and the Resurrection.

And in the vestments, what a glowing sunset of colour—white, red, blue, green and gold.

There is the set of "white silk" vestments, with the "orphrey of red satin," the "chasuble figured with a Crucifix, the Virgin Mary, and damask flowers on the back".

There, too, the white vestment, "with orphrey of green satin worked with gold: for the Mass of the Virgin".

Or the set of red vestments "made out of the robe which the Most Christian Prince, King Henry VI., gave"; and the chasuble which has "the Crucifix on the back and the Trinity on its upper part".

Or the set of red damask, with its "orphrey of cloth of gold". On the back is "the Crucifix, and at the foot two Angels and St. Peter," worked in "cloth of gold".

Or the set of "blue velvet, worked with golden stars and crowns," and the set of "blue velvet," with the "orphrey of cloth of gold worked with a Crucifix, Mary and St. John," the chasuble having "three Angels on its back," and over them "the Trinity".

Or a set "of green silk, with orphrey of cloth of gold—the gift of the famous Bishop Waynflete. Embroidered on the back of the chasuble is the Adoration of the Magi—the

three Kings of Cologne and the Virgin and the Child". And again, "Our Blessed Lady and St. Joseph," with a foreground of golden roses.

The Trinity—the Atonement—Our Lady—St. Joseph—St. Peter—St. John!

Surely it is easy to read in such a brilliant book what were the truths, and what were the Saints that were uppermost in the minds and hearts of our Catholic ancestors.

The other accessories of Catholic worship are not less significant.

There is, for the Blessed Sacrament, "the pyx of crystal mounted in silver-gilt"—nearly six pounds in weight—"with a cover and foot, and images of Jesus Christ, the Blessed Virgin, and St. John on the top, and three precious stones".

There is the "silver chrismatory, set with stones," which contains the consecrated oils used in the conferring of Baptism, Confirmation, Holy Orders and Extreme Unction.

Here are no less than seven "silver" and "silver-gilt thuribles". The arm of the altar-boy must have ached on the morrow of a great function during which he had been swinging the "great silver thurible, weighing 72 ounces".

Here are silver "incense boat and spoon"—the "silver holy water pot and sprinkler"—the "two gold phials" or cruets, used at Mass, and engraved with "the Arms of France and England".

These silver-gilt tablets, oblong or circular, with a handle above or behind, are for service at Mass. They are given to the people to kiss, as a symbol of fraternal peace and intercommunion just before the Communion. Hence they are each called a "*Pax*," or an "*instrumentum pacis*," or an "*osculatorium pacis*".

Here are eight of them.

Let us put them side by side and note the inscriptions.

For, as the *Pax* was in constant use, piety naturally prompted the engraving on the part to be kissed of some subject which would appeal to Catholic devotion.

The first has enamelled on it "the ymages of the Crucifix, the Blessed Virgin, and St. John".

The second has "the ymages of the Crucifix and the Blessed Virgin and St. John, with twenty-four white roses".

The third has "an ymage of the Crucifix".

The fourth has "an ymage of Jesus Christ".

The fifth has the "ymages of the Virgin and the Child, and white and red roses".

The sixth has "an ymage of the Crucifix set with stones and inscribed with the Gospels".

The seventh has "an ymage of the Saviour inscribed with the Epistles".

The eighth has "the ymage of St. Peter and St. Paul, inscribed with the Epistles and Gospels".

The Crucified Saviour, Our Lady and St. John, St. Peter and St. Paul—such were the well-beloved figures which, Sunday by Sunday, were devoutly pressed to the lips of the generations of the faithful at Winchester.

There is the great "chalice and paten of gold".

With it are twelve silver or silver-gilt chalices (averaging twenty-two ounces each), enamelled or embossed with images.

We set them in a row, and watch how they reproduce the Catholic lessons embroidered on the vestments.

Let us note the inscriptions and images as we pass along the line.

"The Holy Trinity."

"The Blessed Virgin and St. John."

"God" the Father, seated on a throne and "with outstretched hands".

"The Crucifixion with the Blessed Virgin and St. John."

"Jesus Christ."

"The Blessed Virgin and St. John."

"The Blessed Virgin and St. John."

"Jesus Christ."

"The passion of St. Thomas the Martyr."

"The Crucifixion" and "Jesu" on the paten.

"The Crucifix between two trees" and the "Holy Trinity" on the paten.

"The Crucifixion with the Blessed Virgin and St. John,"

and on the paten "An ymage of the Saviour seated and with outstretched arms".

"The Crucifixion with the Blessed Virgin and St. John," and on the paten "An ymage of the Saviour".

"The Crucifixion," and on the paten "An *Agnus Dei*" or Lamb of God.

"The Crucifixion, the Blessed Virgin and St. John," and on the paten "the Holy Trinity" and the words "Let us bless the Lord" and "Jesu".

"The Virgin and the Child" and the words "Jesus Christ, Son of God," and on the paten "The Lord is the Protector of my life".

"The Crucifixion" and an "ymage of God" on the paten.

"Jesu Christe," and on the paten "Let us bless the Father and the Son".

How emphatically and persistently this iconography of the Winchester chalices teaches us the strength and ardour with which the faith of the English Church identified the Sacrifice of the Mass with the Sacrifice of the Cross—the altar with Calvary—and felt that the Saviour of mankind is not less truly in the hands of the priest than He was in the arms of Mary, and that He rests not less really upon the paten than He did in the crib at Bethlehem!

We have here in their authentic fulness and clearness the apparatus of religion as it existed in Winchester before the Reformation—the ancient religion of the land.

But is it—does it look like—the religion of the Book of Common Prayer and the Thirty-nine Articles?

In such sacred memorials we read indeed a graphic record which our fathers in the fervour of their faith loved to trace upon all that was most precious of their gold and silver.

It is a record which tells its own tale with a voice which nothing can silence. Its import is one which goes directly home to the inmost depth of the Catholic heart and conscience.

It is all that and more, but it is not the record of the Dean's continuity.

CHAPTER LIV.

Winchester Worship.

(15TH JULY, 1893.)

IT is still the year 1525, and we are standing in the College Chapel at Winchester.

We have seen its church furniture.

We have now to witness its worship.

The College is eminently a "House of Prayer".

William of Wykeham was above all things a man of action and construction. He had handled the weightiest affairs of the State. Undertakings of national magnitude and importance had issued safely and successfully from his hands. He had done England's message in foreign lands, and embassies of delicate import had been, with the happiest results, entrusted to his keeping.

Who would have marvelled if we had found in this great mediæval prelate, on whose mind the Court and the public life of the nation had made so large an impact, somewhat less of the love of prayer, and of appreciation of its needfulness, than we should have naturally looked for in a bishop of cloistered views and monastic temperament? And yet it was very much otherwise. Piety and prayerfulness were amongst the most prominent features which William of Wykeham stamped upon his foundation at Winchester.

Let us try to measure the volume of its daily devotion.

We begin with what we may call individual prayers.

Those eleven priests, dressed each in a black robe, reaching to the ground and surmounted by a hood, are the Warden and the ten Fellows of the College.

(A.) This morning, as soon as they had risen from their beds (*cum de lecto surrexerint*), they have said:—

1. The Antiphon and Versicle of the Holy Trinity.
2. The prayer "Almighty and Eternal God".
3. The prayer for the soul of the Founder (Collect in our Missal of the Mass of Holy Trinity).

"O God, who amongst Thy Apostolic priests, hast bestowed on Thy servant, our Founder, the episcopal dignity, grant, we

beseech Thee, that he may also be joined to their perpetual society. Through Christ our Lord."

(B.) Then during the day, at an hour which each may choose for himself, they will say for the souls of King Edward III. and certain members of the royal family, for the soul of the founder and for the souls of his parents:—

1. The Psalm "Out of the Depths".
2. Kyrie eleison, etc.
3. Our Father and Hail Mary.
4. The prayer "Incline, O Lord".
5. "O God, the Creator and Redeemer of all the faithful," etc. (inserting "John and Sibylla," the names of the father and mother of William of Wykeham).
6. "O God, who amongst," as above.

(If any of the eleven should inadvertently allow the day to pass without saying these prayers for the dead, he is to be careful to supply for the omission on the following day.)

(C.) Again, after High Mass each day, when the office of None has been said, and before the warden leaves the choir, they say for the soul of the Founder:—

1. The "Out of the Depths".
2. Our Father and Hail Mary.
3. "O God, who amongst Thy Apostolic priests," etc., as above.
4. "Absolve, we beseech Thee, the soul of thy servant."
5. "May the soul of our Founder, and the souls of all the faithful departed, by the mercy of God, rest in peace."

(The above Psalm and Collects are familiar to all Catholic readers, and will be found in any Catholic Prayer-book.)

(D.) After grace at dinner, the same prayers are recited.

(E.) And in like manner after grace at supper.

Thus, no less than five times each a day, the bond of Catholic Communion was lovingly renewed between the living and the dead. And the Warden and his Fellows lifted up mind and heart in the beautiful liturgy of the Church to pray for the soul of their Founder.

And William of Wykeham was intensely in earnest about these prayers.

He writes it down in his Statutes of Foundation that he

wants them to be said day by day—and not until the Reformation—but “*for evermore*” :—

“*Dici volumus singulis diebus in perpetuum*”.

And in laying this conscientious obligation—this tithe of prayer—upon those who benefit by his donation and foundation, he most clearly gives them to understand that it is not a matter which he will suffer to be treated lightly.

“Upon all of which things,” he says, “before the Most High God, with all strictness we charge the conscience of each and of them all.”¹

In no part of Christendom, save in the religious bodies born of the Reformation, is intercession for the dead regarded as other than a holy and wholesome duty of Christian love.

Devout Anglicans, naturally wishful to find standing-ground upon the practice of Catholic antiquity, are ever and anxiously assuring us that on this matter the teaching of their Church is at one with the East and with our own; and they point, in evidence of their plea, to the existence of certain guilds, and to the service of Requiem elaborately celebrated in certain of their churches.

On such a point, we could heartily wish that they were right. For in being so, they would have come at least one step doctrinally nearer to us than they have been.

But we do not think that they are. At least, they have brothers, blunt of speech, who say “No”—and who say it with all possible plainness to every one we know.

If these, the true-bred Reformational Protestants, were right, the worst we could say would be that they acted consistently on what we believe to be their heretical convictions.

But if the higher Anglican contention *were* in any sense right, and if prayers for the dead were really an Anglican doctrine, ah! then the actual authorities at Winchester would be well and wisely employed in preparing the answer which they, in common with all those who have lived in his house, and eaten his bread, will have to give to William of Wykeham at the day of Judgment.

His voice still rings in their statutes, and surely must sound in their ears.

¹ *Super quibus omnibus ipsorum omnium et singulorum conscientias apud Altissimum oneramus* (Statutes, c. 28).

“Upon all of which things, before the Most High God, with all strictness, we charge the consciences of each and of them all.”

.

Now we turn to the public services.

The order of these for each day has been by the hand of the Founder minutely specified.

Several times each day the Warden and the Fellows and Chaplains assembled in this chapel to celebrate—*cum cantu et nota*—the daily round of the Church’s worship.

Matins and Lauds about dawn.

Prime—the Church’s morning prayer—about sunrise.

Terce.

Mass.

Sext and None during the day.

Vespers and Compline (the Church’s night prayer) at the close of the day.

“In like manner we decree, ordain, and will, that every day, throughout the year, Vespers, Matins, Masses, and the other canonical hours of the day shall be devoutly celebrated with chant and music in our said College near Winchester by the Priests, perpetual Fellows of the said College, and the Chaplains and Clerics engaged for this purpose, as aforementioned, according to the use and custom of the Cathedral Church of Salisbury, and the distinction and ordinance hereinafter set forth” (William of Wykeham’s Statutes, c. 29).

Here we have the Canonical round of daily Sacrifice, prayer, and praise, by which the College threw its voice into the great chorus of worship, which swelled so joyfully from every church throughout the land, and in which the voice of England herself sung her glorious part in the great concert of Catholic Christendom.

Surely never was unity like to the Church’s unity!

But the daily worship of the College was not to end here.

Around these, the central and canonical offices, was raised a setting of supplemental services rich in the harmony of faith and charity.

Let us examine them more closely at hand.

.

We are standing before one of the side chapels. At the altar is a priest, vested in "a black velvet chasuble," on the back of which is a representation of our Lord's "Sepulchre".¹

He is saying the Mass for the Dead.

We hear him saying the Collect, *Deus qui inter Apostolicos*, for the soul of William Wykeham, and also the Collect *Fidelium Deus*, the same which we still say after the psalm "Out of the Depths".

If we can approach sufficiently near to the altar we can hear the whispered words of the Canon—verbally the same as it is said at our altars to-day:—

"Which in the first place we offer Thee for Thy Holy Catholic Church, to which vouchsafe to grant peace, as also to preserve, unite, and govern it throughout the world, together with Thy Servant Clement our Pope, and Richard our Bishop, and Henry our King."²

And just before the Communion, we can hear the words of that most pathetic part of the Requiem Mass—a Mass in which all is so full of sacred pathos—when the priest, taking our Lord, "the Lamb as if slain," into his hands, thrice appeals to Him, by the blood in which He washed away the sins of the world, to give rest to the souls of the departed:—

¹ Inventory of College Chapel Goods, A.D. 1525.

² When in 1893 Sir John Stuart Knill, the Catholic Lord Mayor of London, recognising that law of ordinary Christian decency, which gives the spiritual precedence over the temporal, placed the name of the spiritual Sovereign of Christ's kingdom before that of the temporal Sovereign of these realms, he was but following with genuine Catholic and Christian instinct one of the most venerable and historic usages of the English nation. Before the Reformation daily at every altar in England, in the recitation of the Canon, and Sunday by Sunday in every parish church throughout the land in the vernacular recitation of the Bidding-prayer, the generations of the English race invariably prayed for the spirituality before the temporality, and for the "Pope" before the "King". The action of the Lord Mayor was, in every sense, far more truly English than that of his critics, and was, in fact, the faithful reproduction of the traditional practice of the whole English people for nearly a thousand years of their history. So any one who looks into a Sarum Missal or into an ancient form of Bidding-prayer may easily see for himself. So prayed in their parish churches the Barons who won for England the Great Charter. So prayed the victors of Poitiers, Creçy and Agincourt. The Lord Mayor might well rest content to be as English and loyal as they.

“Lamb of God, who takest away the sins of the world,
Give to them rest everlasting”.

We turn to another side chapel.

Here the priest at the altar is vested in one of those “white silk” chasubles with “golden orphreys” mentioned in the inventory of 1525.

He is saying the Mass of Our Blessed Lady.

William of Wykeham specifies that this Mass shall be said each day, with its usual Collect, and the Postcommunion prayer which we say this day at the end of the Angelus.

In this Mass, the statutes prescribe the five following collects:—

The first, of Our Lady, as above.

The second, for the Bishop of Winchester.

The third, for the King.

The fourth, for the soul of William of Wykeham (*Deus qui inter Apostolicos*).

The fifth, for the souls of the parents of William of Wykeham and all the faithful departed.

At another side chapel is said a third Mass according to the feast of the day.

A fourth and fifth Mass are said for certain friends and benefactors of the College.

Finally, a sixth and seventh Mass are said with the Collects for the founder. Thus according to the will and ordinance of William of Wykeham no day (save only Good Friday) ever closed over Winchester College Chapel that the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass was not offered up seven times upon its altars.¹

The first of these was of Our Blessed Lady, the third of the Feast, and the rest for the souls of the faithful departed.

How does this daily sevenfold celebration of the Sacrifice

¹ We also decree, ordain, and wish that every day for evermore—except Good Friday—seven Masses, for fixed intentions, be devoutly celebrated in the aforesaid chapel after the Matins and Prime for the day. Of which the first shall be of Holy Mary (William of Wykeham, c. 29).

of the Mass—Mass of the Blessed Virgin, Mass for souls in Purgatory—stand in “continuity” with that passage in the Dean’s Prayer-book which speaks of such “sacrifices” as “blasphemous fables” and “dangerous deceits”?

Let us go to a Sunday’s service.

The Warden, Vice-Warden, Fellows and Scholars are all to be “personally present at First and Second Vespers, at the Matins, at the Masses, at the processions and the other canonical hours”.

The Warden, Vice-Warden and Fellows and the older Scholars occupy the stalls.

The Warden wears over his surplice the grey almuce or tippet—a mark of ecclesiastical dignity.

The Vice-Warden, the Fellows and Chaplains wear their “almuces furred or penulated,” while the Scholars are attired in simple white surplices over their black cloth robes, which reach to the ground.

This solemn assistance of the whole College community at the Offices of the day is insisted upon not only on Sundays but on all the great festivals of the Church.

“And, moreover, we decree, ordain, and will that on the Feasts of Christmas, Circumcision, Epiphany, Easter, Ascension, Pentecost, on Feasts of the Holy Virgin Mary, the Trinity, Corpus Christi, All Saints, the Dedication Feast of the Chapel, the Nativity of St. John, and the Feast of the Apostles SS. Peter and Paul, the Warden, Vice-Warden, or one of the Senior Fellows of the College, shall personally, with its proper chant, solemnly celebrate the First and Second Vespers, the High Mass, and the other (canonical) hours of the day, and carry out the same with completeness in the aforesaid chapel” (Statutes of William of Wykeham, c. 29).

There is yet another scene which marked itself memorably in the yearly round of the College life.

We are once more in the College Chapel. This time the altar is draped in black. The stalls are filled with the Warden and Fellows, and all the Scholars are assembled to take part in the service.

It is still in the dim light of the dawn, and they are

singing the Office of the Dead for the soul of the Founder on this the obit, or anniversary of his death.

We can hear the beautiful words of the Invitatory, in which the Church, freeing our souls from all the narrow limitations of time and place, and death, carries them up to God, in whom there is nothing but Life, and in whose life, by a real intercommunion, we meet again and recover those whom we have lost here below :—

“ Regem, cui omnia vivunt : venite adoremus ! ”

“ The King, to whom all things live, come let us adore.”

Later on we witness the High Mass, in which the name of the Founder is mentioned in the Collect. We hear the sacring bell while the Victim of Salvation is offered in propitiation for his soul upon the altar.

Year by year, as this day returns, the same great act of Catholic faith and unforgetting charity will mark the gratitude of the Winchester School to the great Bishop whose zeal and munificence called it into existence.

Let us sum up.

Personal prayers for the soul of the Founder said five times a day by the Warden and Fellows.

Litanies, Psalms and Office of the Dead said daily by the priests.

The Canonical hours seven times each day.

Seven Masses said in the chapel each morning.

The Mass and Office of the Dead solemnly sung upon the obit.

These are the conditions upon which men were to live in the house, and eat the bread of William of Wykeham.

But times are changed, and certainly people have changed with them. Must a certain latitude not be allowed in interpreting conditions written in days so different from our own? Would William of Wykeham himself really insist upon the observance of these conditions in a strictly literal or grammatical sense? May we not well believe that such an insistence on the letter of his statutes would be largely

inconsistent with the broad-minded wisdom and practical good sense of the great Bishop of Winchester?

On that point, we had better allow William of Wykeham to speak for himself.

“By the tenor of these presents, We decree, ordain and will, that *by no means, and at no time*, shall it be lawful for the Bishop of Winchester, for the time ruling, after it shall please God to withdraw us from this life—nor for the Warden or Fellows of our aforesaid College—either now or those that shall be, individually or collectively, nor for any other person of whatsoever dignity, state, rank, or condition he may be, to issue, frame, ordain, decree or promulgate any new statutes, ordinances, rules, constitutions, interpretations, changes, injunctions, declarations or other expoundings, repugnant to or derogating from, differing from, or out of harmony with, or contrary to, these our present statutes and ordinances set forth or to be set forth, or not in accordance with the true and plain understanding of the same.

“Nor do we wish that by any custom or abuse or any occasion whatsoever, should any departure be made from the intention and terms of our statutes and ordinances. We are unwilling, moreover, that any interpretation should be made concerning the same, or about them, except according to the *plain sense, the common understanding, the literal and grammatical meaning* which most aptly belongs to the case or pretended doubt about which any question may be raised” (Statutes, c. 45, conclusion).

If there remains any loophole of escape for the conscience of those who have radically changed the worship of the Winchester School, it is certainly not due to any lack of vigilance and foresight on the part of William of Wykeham.

CHAPTER LV.

Winchester School.

(22ND JULY, 1893.)

WE have reached the last slide of this lantern lecture.

It presents to us what in our estimation is one of the most salient and the most significant features of William of Wykeham's School at Winchester,

We cast it upon the screen.

Three rows of white oblong figures with something attached as a pendant to each.

For a moment let us reserve the reading of the riddle.

William of Wykeham, in founding his school, had a strong desire that it should last for ever. As he himself affirms over and over again, its constitution was to be "in perpetuity".

But this ensuring of perpetuity, by which an institution is sent safely down through centuries, until it reaches the remotest posterity, is not by any means so simple a matter as might at first sight be expected.

Many potential enemies have to be provided against.

To begin with, William of Wykeham was only a diocesan bishop. Water does not rise above its own level, and things created by diocesan power can never rise above diocesan authority. The bishop's power is precisely that of his successors. How was he to protect his foundation against those who would come after him? If an institution rests on merely a diocesan basis, the power of the ordinary over it is measured upon his pastoral responsibility, and is necessarily great. His goodwill is the breath of its nostrils. His disfavour is almost proportionately fatal. Canon Law throws its safeguards over benefices and vested interests, but what can shield a purely diocesan college—or at least its working prosperity—against the power of him whom the Church recognises as the sole legislator of his diocese?

An average episcopate, if hostile, is quite sufficiently long, if not to suppress—if not to wreck—at least to enfeeble unto death any institution which, by its diocesan calibre, rests more or less in the hollow of the hand of the bishop.

What bishop, in founding a College, can be sure that it will run the gauntlet of his successors? It only requires that there should be one or two unfriendly in the long line of succession, and his institution may perish from lack of patronage. It is a part of its diocesan condition that it should live to a large extent at the mercy of the ordinary.

It might of course happen that all the bishops of the diocese for time evermore would see things in quite the

same light, and would be one and all unanimously in its favour. But as human affairs go, the chances would be a hundred to one against such a contingency, and one to a hundred would represent, with average accuracy, the institution's chances of perpetuity.

There are Church institutions which—like our ancient Universities or Public Schools—were called upon to discharge functions of almost national importance. They could not be founded in the air, nor could they set foot on English soil without standing on the territory of a bishop. Yet never could they have fulfilled their rôle of national usefulness had they received no measure of emancipation from local Episcopal jurisdiction.

Then there were possible enemies to be contemplated from without.

Large landed endowments are potentially at the mercy of the State. One sovereign might be favourable and allow the enfeoffment to be made. Who could answer for his successors?

Or, even if they too were friendly, they might be displaced by dynastic revolutions, and who could tell how far the new régime would ratify the charters or privileges of its predecessor? In troublous times, even the law itself could not always ensure security of title or undisturbed possession of property.

The mediæval remedy for all these dangers to perpetuity was a Papal Bull of Privilege or Exemption.

It may be doubted if any remedy could ever be found to render any institution perfectly proof against all changes of time and tide; but a Papal Bull in the Middle Ages went probably as near to doing so as anything ever had done in the past, or as anything ever will do in the future.

It was the highest attainable guarantee of stability.

For example:—

In founding his College, did the Bishop fear that the course of ages might give him an antipathetic or capricious successor who would pull down what he had raised up?

He procured a Papal Bull of Foundation.

The Bull lifted his College up, and placed it on a super-diocesan basis. The possible successor might be as hostile as he pleased, but the College as an institution was above his reach. It was taken out of his hand and placed in the strong hand of St. Peter.

Did the Founder fear that the possible successor, if unable to suppress it, might harass it, curtail its freedom of action, and hamper its liberty?

He procured for it a Bull of Exemption; or if he wished it still to remain under the jurisdiction of the ordinary, he had its liberties assured by a Bull of Privilege.

The possible successor would know that any attempt upon liberties thus guaranteed, would be met by the College by protest, and appeal to Canterbury or Rome, and that the mere presentment of the Bull would decide the appeal in its favour.

Did a lawless baron seek to harry the property of the Institution? Did even a wilful or wayward Sovereign of the realm seek to suppress it? The Papal Bull cast over the Institution and its lands a protection, to which, by the polity of the Middle Ages, Sovereigns and Barons felt it both a duty and a need to render respect.

If dynastic changes displaced a Sovereign from the throne, or discredited his charter, the Papal Bull would remain in force, and would find recognition from the new ruler not less than from the old.

Were even a foreign prince to invade the land, as did William the Conqueror, the Papal Bull would challenge the conscience of the victor as successfully as it had done that of the vanquished.

An infraction of such a Bull would render the offender—*"cujuscumque dignitatis"*—liable to answer for his transgression before the Sovereign Pontiff; and would at the very least open the way to have the issue adjudged by the highest, the most permanent, and most peaceful tribunal in Christendom.

It was thus, that amid the fierce struggles and upheavals of mediæval life, a Papal Bull conveyed to a given institution, as far as it could be conveyed, a share in that perpetual

solidity and stability which could only be sought and found in the Rock of St. Peter.

If the ancient English Church is so rich in venerable and national and time-honoured institutions, and if in her galaxy of Collegiate churches, and schools, and foundations there is so much that survived when most things else passed away, and stood firm while all things else were transformed; and if thus they were able to confer upon the nation the enormous advantage of that continuous and age-long service which forms the chiefest charm of historic glory, may we not justly feel that at least a part of that result is due to the fact that for so long a time they were shielded from the caprice of friends, and the covetousness of foes, by the Papal Bulls of Exemption and Privilege that lay side by side with the Royal Grants in their Chartularies?

It is one of the most hopeful signs of the times in which we live that a large and influential body of Anglican thinkers and writers has turned a wistful, sympathetic and searching gaze into the centuries of English religious life which preceded the Reformation. We can hardly believe that they will long continue to do so without being irresistibly led to seize upon and appreciate, in their true meaning and scope, the dominant features of mediæval church-life, and, what is not less important, to compare them, in the light of recent experiences, with the conditions under which they themselves live and struggle for even a modicum of nominal Church independence. Granted that they bring to the study of the problem earnestness, honesty and learned research—all of which we take as unquestionable—granted the due measure of time for the evolution of thought and the gradual removal of traditional preconceptions—we love to hope that the conclusion borne in upon their convictions will be one of deep and far-reaching importance. In the present order of things, and in the inevitable trial of strength which must ever go on between the Church and the world, men will not easily discover a more solid or splendid guarantee of true Church liberty than the possession of a fulcrum of security and resistance outside the country, and beyond the realm and reach of the Civil Power.

Without such a fulcrum to serve as a standing-ground and backing, the precious victories which St. Anselm, St. Thomas and Stephen Langton won for the English Church would never have been attempted, much less achieved.

A complementary truth is that a Church can never be "*national*" (in the sense of having no centre outside the national territory) without putting its freedom at the mercy of the State, and lapsing into a condition of ecclesiastical enslavement.

Applied to a Church, "*national*" and "*independent*" are terms which, in closer analysis, will be found to mutually exclude each other.

It is a truth which is written in the life of nations, and one over which the Anglican and the Greek may clasp hands in sorrow and sympathy.

Few men seem to have appreciated the value of Papal Authority, as a guarantee of liberty and stability, more keenly and clearly than did William of Wykeham, and those who succeeded him in the management of the school at Winchester.

Let us observe that to obtain a Papal Bull was not in the least a simple or easy matter. It required a petition to the Roman Court, couriers to carry it, and proctors to present it, and advocates to promote it. It involved a lengthy process, and much had to be said and done, and urged and answered, before the leaden seals were attached to the hempen or silken cords, and the portentous parchment was placed in the hands of the couriers to carry it back to England.

It meant months of labour—a thousand miles' journey to and fro, over sea and land—and, were it merely for the expense of couriers or proctors, a bill of costs which would kindle the admiration of a modern lawyer.

If William of Wykeham and the Wardens of Winchester had thus sought out and procured but one such Bull, we should have possessed in their doing so an unanswerable proof of the practical nature of their recognition of the Pope's spiritual jurisdiction in England.

But, in point of fact, they did something more than this.

We turn to the screen to read the riddle and unfold the interpretation thereof.

William of Wykeham and the authorities of Winchester College petitioned for, and procured, not merely one Papal Bull.

They sought for and obtained no less than thirteen.

The thirteen oblong figures cast on the screen are the thirteen Winchester College Bulls, with their pendant seals, bearing the images of St. Peter and St. Paul.

Let us indicate their import.¹

The first is the Bull of Foundation granted by Urban VI.

The second is a Bull obtained from Pope Boniface IX. to allow the Warden to hold benefice with cure of souls.

The third is a Bull enabling the Warden to let the lands of the College on lease.

The fourth is a Bull granting to the College the right of free sepulture.

The fifth is a Bull allowing the Warden to exchange his benefice.

The sixth is a Bull "allowing the Warden and Scholars to have Masses performed *cum notâ et alta voce* and Sacraments administered in the precincts of the College".²

The seventh decrees that all oblations and legacies shall go to the College and not to the diocesan.

The eighth enables the Warden and Scholars to retain all burial fees and oblations made within the College.

The ninth empowers "the Warden and Scholars to have a belfry and bells".

The tenth allows the College Chapel and Graveyard, in case of desecration, to be reconciled by a clerk in Holy Orders using holy water blessed by the bishop.

¹The synopsis of these Bulls may be found in *Annals of Winchester College*, by T. F. Kirby, M.A., p. 4. Their purport may be seen more fully stated in the *Calendar of Papal Letters*, vol. iv., 333, 354, 387, 390, 391, 397, 422, 439, 440, 441; vol. v., 171, 172. As a matter of fact the number of Bulls issued from the Roman Chancery in favour of the College was at least nineteen.

²Ten perpetual secular priests, assisted by three clerks and sixteen boys, were appointed for the singing of the Mass and Divine Office (see Summary of Bull of Confirmation in *Calendar of Papal Letters*, vol. iv., 422).

The eleventh grants 100 days' relaxation of penance and forty years' indulgence to all who visit the Chapel and help in its construction.

The twelfth allows the Warden and members of the Foundation to receive Holy Orders from any bishop in communion with the Apostolic See.

The thirteenth grants to the College the revenues of certain alien priories.

Such a picture is surely a fair object-lesson of the manner in which Papal Authority interpenetrated the whole fabric of religious life in Pre-Reformation England.

We turn to the Bull of Foundation.

It was issued by Pope Urban VI. on 1st June, 1378; and despatched to the Bishop of Rochester as Papal Commissioner for its due execution.

Let us read the tall Gothic characters, translating as we go:—

“Urban, Bishop, the Servant of the Servants of God, to Our venerable brother, the Bishop of Rochester, health and Apostolical Benediction.

“The sincere devotion which Our venerable brother William, Bishop of Winchester, bears to Us and to the Roman Church, deserves that We should look with favour upon his requests, and more especially upon those which have for their object the good of religion, the diffusion of salutary knowledge, and the salvation of souls.

“We have had recently laid before Us the petition of the said Bishop, in which it is set forth that, desiring by a happy barter to exchange the things of time for those that are eternal, and the things of earth for those that are of heaven; and considering that the knowledge of letters promotes the observance of justice, and betters the conditions of human life; he proposes, for the increase of Divine worship, for the honour and glory of God, and for the salvation of his soul, and the souls of his parents, his successors, and others of the faithful of Christ, out of the goods lawfully acquired or hereafter to be acquired by him, whether in regard of his own person or of the Church of Winchester entrusted to his care, or from other sources, to institute a

College of seventy poor scholar-clerks, who are to live in community and study grammar in a suitable and respectable place chosen for the purpose, near the city of Winchester, and also to found and build and sufficiently endow one house with a chapel or oratory for the aforesaid College.”

William of Wykeham had in his patronage the parish church of Downton, in the diocese of Salisbury. He wished to have the revenues of this church added to his own *mensa* or household income, so that he might the more easily support the poor scholars of his College at Winchester. He asked the Pope to let him have it. The second clause in the Bull recites the petition :—

“And whereas, on the part of the said Bishop—who, it is stated, has from his own goods given the necessaries of life to the grammar scholars studying in the said city—we have been humbly petitioned out of the graciousness of the Apostolic See¹ to deign to grant him permission to do the aforesaid, and in order that they may be the more easily and becomingly supported, to unite, attach and perpetually incorporate the parochial church of Downton in the diocese of Salisbury, which belongs to the patronage of the Bishop of Winchester for the time ruling, to the household income of the said Bishop.”

The third is the operative clause, authorising both the foundation of the College and the annexation of the Downton revenue :—

“Therefore, We, yielding to the petitions of your brothership, by Apostolic Letters command that, an endowment for the chapel and for the maintenance of the said scholars, and for meeting the cost of those set over them, having been duly provided by the said Bishop, you shall grant permission, with Our authority to the said Bishop to institute, found and build the aforesaid College, house and chapel, and as soon as the aforesaid College has been built, to unite, incorporate and annex with the same authority, the aforesaid parochial church perpetually to the aforesaid

¹ “*De benignitate Apostolicá dignaremus.*”

Episcopal income, even although it should be, with all its rights and appurtenances, generally or specially reserved to the disposition of the Holy See."

The rest of the clause provides for the vicar at Downton, and secures the endowment from any devolution to other purposes.

The Bull concludes with the usual formula:—

"We declare henceforth null and void whatever may be adversely attempted, whether wittingly or unwittingly, by whatsoever authority. Given at Rome, at St. Peter's, on the Kalends of June, in the first year of Our Pontificate" (A.D. 1378).

If ever there was a palpably plain Papal Foundation, it was William of Wykeham's College of Winchester.

On the 25th of July, 1893, the authorities of the College have kept its quincentenary.

The Archbishop of Canterbury preached on the occasion.

It is with such facts looking him in the face that he was constrained to make out a case of "Anglican Continuity".

What could he do in such a position but fall back upon the Lambeth quadrilateral and its data which are radically and emphatically Protestant.

1. "A valid Apostolic ministry"—which two-thirds of Christendom refuses to recognise, and which more than one of his suffragans holds to be non-essential.

2. "Two Sacraments out of seven"—and so little security with regard to their meaning, that his clergy are free to deny the spiritual regeneration in the one, and are equally free to teach the Real Presence or Real Absence in the other.

3. "Two Testaments"—with freedom as to the interpretation or inspiration of any particular passage of each.

4. "Two Creeds"—repeated *verbally*, in the same terms, by persons who individually take the most diverse and opposite views as to the *meaning* of its articles. As if unity were in the material paper or the sounds and letters, and not in the truth signified!

It is with such fragile and threadbare strands that the Archbishop has had to weave the cord of his continuity.

The Nestorian was condemned at Ephesus, and the

Donatist was denounced by St. Augustine. But is there anything in the above fourfold element that the Nestorian and the Donatist did not possess in a far higher, fuller and clearer, and more unquestionable measure than the modern Anglican?

And yet who will regret if that which is highest and best in the Anglican Communion shall feel itself impelled in these later times to remind the English people of the glorious tale of the olden days, and to read the book of the Chronicles of bygone years to soothe the restless vigil of the sovereign people? Mardochai's part in the past and place in the future will be safe in the hands of Him who prompted both the reader and the listener.

CHAPTER LVI.

Votive Candle-Burning.

(23RD SEPTEMBER, 1893.)

A MERE straw floating upon the face of the current often serves to indicate the direction or mark the height of the tide.

We may be allowed to accept a comparatively trifling incident which recently occurred at Shoreditch as the register-float of the rising tide of the Anglican movement.

This, which is—or was a few weeks ago—the latest reading, points to the line at which votive candles are bought and burned before the image of Our Blessed Lady.

The Society of St. Osmund held the festival of its patron at the Church of St. Michael in Shoreditch. The Society devotes itself to the admirable work of promoting the study and revival of the ritual of the ancient English Church—the ritual which slipshod tongues too often glibly describe as the “Sarum Rite,” when they mean the *Sarum Use*, to wit, the “Roman Rite according to the use of Sarum”.

A correspondent of *The Church Times* records that the festival was duly celebrated by “High Mass”—that “the service was elaborate,” or, as a daily contemporary had expressed it, “the spectacle was truly superb”—that not

only the clergy, but even the servers were arrayed in "apparelled albes and amices"—that the music was so "severely Gregorian throughout" that a part of the congregation (with whom we can partly sympathise) felt it to be disappointingly "Archaic"—and last, though not least, that "after the service the Angelus was rung on the big bell of the Church".

We may not be able to give the august name of Mass to the ceremony. Nor may we feel ourselves in a position to say more than that God will not fail to reward, wherever He finds it, the piety and sincerity of His worshippers. But we can at least gladly do justice to the excellent motives which prompt the revival of the historic features of ancient Catholic worship, and feel both grateful and hopeful for the educational influence which such functions cannot fail to have upon the religious opinion of England.

The Society had done its liturgical best to honour the Feast of St. Osmund, but it was not responsible for the burning of the votive tapers before the image of Our Lady.

Apparently some one in authority, who approved of the practice, and who had learned to love its simple and devotional beauty, felt—and, we think, very correctly—that the meeting of such a society was a singularly fitting occasion on which to recommend it more prominently to the notice of the public.

No doubt the majority of the members of a society, whose minds would naturally be familiar with pre-Reformation ritual, would see in the votive tapers lighted before the Madonna nothing more than a fresh and pleasing note of harmony with ancient English practice.

There are two reasons why Anglicanism should have welcomed the introduction of the practice of burning votive tapers.

The first is, that the Anglican body has it much at heart to prove that it is continuously one with the ancient Church of England.

But nothing was more common in the olden time than

for the English people to take a quantity⁷⁷ of wax—which was then very much dearer than at present—and make it into a coil of thin taper—they called it a “trindle”—and burn it as a votive light before the shrine of Our Lady or the Saints.

Reginald of Durham describes it as “*Candela multo saepius plicamine involuta,*” and tells us that there were sometimes as many as sixty-six folds in the same coil.

St. Aelred, in his life of Edward the Confessor, relates how “an unhappy woman was carried to his tomb, and her mistress having a wax-light of her stature, continued in vigils and prayers”.

So deeply had the practice entered into the religious customs of the English people, that they loved to provide for its being done for them even after death.

Thus in 1467 Baldwin Cocksedge bequeaths “a cow, sufficient to provide for 11 lbs. of wax-lights, to burn before the statue of Blessed Mary in the chancel of St. Peter’s Church at Feldsham”.¹

Long centuries before Baldwin left the “cow sufficient,” the Abbot, Henry of Glastonbury, in A.D. 1126, bequeathed a pension of 50 shillings “to the keeping of a wax-light to burn constantly before the image of the Holy Virgin Mary in the old church of Glastonbury”.

And Hugh, Bishop of Durham (A.D. 1154), “caused to be hung before the altar three silver stands, with their branches in silver, with inserted pieces of crystal, in which burning lights day and night perpetually should shine in honour of the holy father St. Cuthbert and his relics”.²

It was a work in which the laity loved to have their share. Wimark Papedi gave the rent of two houses in Norham, and Eustace de Fenwick gave yearly 2 lbs. of wax, and Robert Fitzroger gave 20s. from the profits of his mills “for lights around St. Cuthbert’s tomb”.³

¹ *Church of Our Fathers*, iii., 272 *et seq.* (Wills of Bury St. Edmunds, 44); (2) *ibid.* (Johannes de Glaston, *de rebus Glaston*, 166).

² *Anglia Sacra*, i., 722; *Historia Dunelmense*, Gaudfridi de Coldingham.

³ *Church of Our Fathers*, iii., 414 (Rames’s *St. Cuthbert*, 99).

Matthew Paris is a monastic historian whose patriotic insularity and Luther-like tongue generally find him favour with certain Anglican writers. He shows us that this practice of burning lights before Our Lady was well known in England when even the Great Charter itself was yet unsealed.

He tells us that the Abbot William (A.D. 1214) "ordained a wax-light, which we are accustomed to twine with flowers, should burn day and night before the small statue of Mary, on her principal feasts, and the processions which are held in her honour".

Perhaps the most characteristic instance of an old English bequest, and one most happily representative of the devotion of the ancient English Church, is that selected by Dr. Rock, taken from the Wills of Bury St. Edmunds.

In 1463 John Baret, of Bury, made his last will and testament, and was specially anxious that his painted image of Our Lady should be hung up against a pillar near the space enclosed about Our Lady's altar. It was to have a bracket or "baas" supporting it, and shielding it from above a canopy or "hovel," with its sides resting on the bracket. Just in front of the bracket he wished to have placed his brass candlestick with its "pyke," or spike as we should call it. On the spike he desired to have burning a taper, for the cost of which he had provided in his will, and which was to form part of five tapers which the Guild of the Nativity kept burning in front of the angels with the chimes which adorned the image of Our Lady of the Pillar.

It' I wil that the ymage of Oure Lady that Robert Pygot peynted, be set up ageyn the peleer next ye peloos of Seinte Marie Awter. With the baas redy thereto, and a hovel with pleyn sides coming down to the baas. And in the myddes of the baas my candylstykke of laten with a pyke to be set afore a tapir, I have assygned unto ye V taperes longgyng to the Nativitie gylde which stant alofte afore the Aungelys with chymes to be set about Our Lady of the Peller (Wills of Bury St. Edmunds, 19).

These methods show the mind and practice of the mediæval English Church.

In the name of continuity, why should not Anglicanism go and do likewise?

Another reason why Anglicans should burn lights before Our Lady is that Anglicanism claims to be Catholic, to make its appeal to the universal custom of East and West (*e.g.*, as to fasting communion), and to fall into line with the Catholic Church on all those points in which East and West are united. Hence, next to being traditionally English, and having the mark of antiquity, the most powerful recommendation of votive candle-burning ought to possess would be the note of ubiquity.

The practice of Western Christendom is as a household word to all of us.

We can all easily recall the familiar scene which presents itself on entering one or other of our churches here, or some of our great cathedrals abroad, when we discern beyond the gloom of the aisles the brightly illuminated corner where the votive tapers gleam around the statue of Our Lady. We can see the fitting forms of those who kneel for a while, each fervently asking the prayers of the Mother of God for what they have most at heart, and we watch them passing in front to place lighted on the socket or spiket a taper which they leave burning behind them to beautify and brighten the altar of Our Lady while they pass on their way to the work to which the world has called them. It may be some anxious mother praying for the sick child at home, whose illness is just at the crisis, or perhaps for the too dearly beloved prodigal who is at home no longer—or it may be for the boy at sea whose parting was but yesterday—or it may be some schoolboy jubilant and thankful for the happy passing of a dreaded examination—or it may be a sister solicitous for the perseverance of a brother—or a father proud and grateful for some achievement of his son—any or all of the thousand and one small joys and sorrows and solitudes that make up the pathos of daily life. And in each the Catholic prays or thanks Our Lady for her help in obtaining from God, the sole great Giver from whom good gifts must needs come through the One Mediator, the wished-for favour,

and he lays the light on her altar as naturally as the Protestant would place a flower on the work-table of a mother, or a wreath on the statue of a statesman to whom he feels politically or patriotically grateful.

Nor is this instinct of piety confined to the West.

Mr. W. Palmer (Fellow of Magdalen College) relates what he witnessed when, as an Anglican clergyman, he visited Russia, in 1841, to negotiate, if possible, some basis of union between the Greek Church and his own.

Describing the Cathedral of the Assumption at Moscow, he mentions the practice of hanging lamps and burning lights before the Iconostasis, the great stand or screen which contains the pictures of Our Lord, and Our Blessed Lady and the Saints :—

“ Also there were huge silver lamps hanging all round the Iconostasis across the church, and below the solea, four immense chandeliers of solid silver, hanging in the centre of the church, and two standing candelabra perhaps six feet high, with platforms round the central wax-light on each, for the tapers which the devotion of the people might light there.”¹

In his account of his visit to the celebrated church at Kazan, Mr. Palmer says :—

“ There was an abundance of pious gesticulations, bowing and crossing, kissing the icons, prostrating and touching the ground with the forehead (sometimes with an audible thump), and bowing and crossing again, and by men, young and old, as well as by women, and small slender wax-lights were bought within the door at a sort of counter and lighted and set up to burn (as if in the name *à l'intention* of those who had set them up) on the great *mannalia* (candelabra) which stand in front of the Iconostasis.”

(In the sentence which follows, the very wording reminds us of John Baret's will made in Bury, in 1463, with its provisions as to the “baas,” and the “pyke” for his votive “tapir”.)

“ Which have a sort of platform round the base that is

¹ *Notes of a Visit to Russia*, 433.

of the great candles, with a multitude of little sockets and spikes for fixing candles offered by private devotion.”¹

In Russia, as in the ancient English Church, the practice was one which entered into the simple religious habits of the poor.

The author cited continues :—

“ One day when I went again my drosky-driver, at the door of the church, gave me back a kopek from his fare, ‘ to set up a candle,’ that so, as he was unable to leave his horse, his prayer might be represented by his candle.”²

The Church Times in discharging its duty of summing up the correspondence which had flowed freely in its columns, and in giving judgment upon the practice referred to, has, strangely enough, condemned it as “ Modern and Roman ”.

As regards the selling of tapers in church for devotees to buy and set up before the image or picture of this or that Saint, the whole thing is such a manifest imitation of modern Roman practice, without a shred of ancient usage, or of Anglican tradition, to excuse it, that all genuine English Catholics must with one voice denounce it.

“ Modern ” is not a word which we usually apply to the practice of English Cathedrals and Abbeys in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries !

“ Roman ” is not an adjective which can be fairly fixed on the practice of the multitudes of Greek Christians who throng the Church at Kazan or the Cathedral of Moscow !

We venture to think that, to those who understand it, the condemnation will pass, and that the practice will remain. Catholics who behold such indications of a fuller realisation of the beauty of Catholic belief and devotion winning its way outside the fold, can only pray that the breath of the Divine Teacher may speedily fan into flame the smoking flax which He “ will not extinguish ”.

¹ *Notes of a Visit to Russia*, 41.

² *Ibid.*

CHAPTER LVII.

A Church Congress and an Appeal to Scripture.

(4TH NOVEMBER, 1893.)

THE recent Church Congress has made plain to the public that the divisions which rend the Anglican Communion grow wider and deeper year by year.

Divisions in themselves can never afford matter of satisfaction to any Christian heart. But there are movements which cannot be effected without divisions, and which not the less are of a healthy and hopeful kind.

Who, for instance, will not rejoice that religious thought in England, actuated, no doubt, by the candour and energy of the national character, presents so little of that deadly stagnation which marks the torpid Protestantism of Sweden and Norway, or even of that stark imperviousness with which Calvinism has opiated some of the countries nearer home?

And who will regret that the time has passed away for ever when that element in the Anglican Church which has come to love and feel the beauty of that which is Catholic will be content to lie mute and benumbed, and undistinguishable from the mass of semi-Puritan Protestantism which represented Anglicanism during the dismal decades of the Caroline and Georgian periods?

That the forces which make for truth and light and beauty should shake themselves free, and draw themselves farther and yet farther apart and finally disentangle themselves from those which keep them back and hold them down, naturally means division and conflict—even disruption. But it is a breaking-up, and a breaking forth which has in its way the nature of an exodus and an evolution, and one the progress of which can cause no intelligent regrets either to ourselves, or, we should say, to those most concerned.

That it is a war waged upon essentials there can be no kind of doubt.

The higher section of Anglicanism has taken up its ground and staked its future for better or worse upon the doctrines of

the Christian Sacrificial Priesthood and Apostolic Succession. These beliefs, which lie at the foundation of creed and worship, are now written once for all upon its banner, and one which it is not likely to strike or to lower in the face of the enemy. Moreover, with its eyes turned eastward and pastward—if not Romeward—it is quite resolved to accept these doctrines in their Catholic *sense*, and to suffer no word-quibbling by which “priest” may be construed into elder or minister, “sacrifice” into “praise in the mouth of the worshipper,” and Episcopacy into a mere optional and *ad bene esse* condition of Church government.

To its credit be it said, it is not prepared to stoop to the childish and dishonest device of the speaker at one of the Grindenwald Conferences, who made a proposal that both parties should unite in accepting Episcopacy, but that each one—by a process of mental reservation?—should be left free to understand the word in its own sense. Higher Anglicanism is too honest not to recognise that union, to be real as conscientious men understand it, must be one of *sense* and not merely of *sound*—a *belief*-union, and not a mere *word*-union, and that any effort made on any other basis would be the merest trifling with religion.

It is in this sense, we take it, that its position found expression at the Congress.

The Rev. C. Gore put the case very forcibly in the paper which he read upon the relation of the Church of England to other bodies:—

Once again, then, we must maintain the four Catholic elements which I have enumerated above, and amongst these the Apostolic Succession of the ministry through the Episcopate, which alone can be shown to have possessed the authority to confer valid orders. Now as the maintenance of the Scriptural appeal precludes a hope of immediate reunion with Rome, so the maintenance of the Apostolic Succession precludes the hope (if it otherwise existed) of rapid reunion with the Nonconformist bodies as wholes. For, first, we cannot admit Nonconformist ministers as “validly ordained ministers of the Word and Sacraments”. If there are some Anglicans who, with nothing but amiable motives, would desire to do this, I would ask them to consider two points only—(1) Are they seriously prepared, on their own principles, to contemplate a step which—whatever would be gained by it—must inevitably cut them off from

communion with the whole of the vast proportion of Anglican Churchmen in Britain, America and the Colonies taken together, who by no stretch of the imagination can be conceived as likely to accept the ministry of persons whom they believe to be not so rightly ordained as to admit of their celebrating a valid—*i.e.*, secure—Eucharist?

It will be observed that Mr. Gore here insists upon the Scriptural appeal. He regards it as the sheet-anchor of faith, and the only effective restraint upon the arbitrary teaching of the clergy.

To state this test in his own words:—

We have retained the Catholic tradition in creed, in Sacraments, in liturgy, in the Apostolic Succession of the ministry through the Episcopate, and we have prevented this original Catholic tradition from becoming corrupted or unduly narrowed, according to the constant tendency of tradition to one-sidedness and accretion, by restoring and emphasising the appeal to Scripture as the unceasing criterion of the Catholic faith, “so that whatever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man, that it should be believed as an article of faith”. It is this combination of two main elements in the Christian religion—tradition and Scripture—which is the characteristic distinction of the Anglican Church, and it is along the lines of fidelity to this characteristic that lies our duty and our opportunity.

And now to apply it:—

Thus, as against Rome, it is worth while maintaining the Scriptural appeal. We could individually obtain the Roman Communion by submitting to the doctrines, for instance, of the Treasury of Merits, of the Immaculate Conception of Mary, and the Infallibility of the Pope. As, in fact, these doctrines did not belong to the original Christian faith, so no candid inquirer can reasonably pretend to find their certificates in the New Testament. Now, this appeal to the New Testament, as the final criterion of what belongs to the faith of our salvation, is the essential for maintaining the Catholic Church, not only in purity, but also in its original largeness.

Here Mr. Gore's whole argument goes to enforce the truth that no doctrine must be taught or imposed upon the Anglican Church unless (as he in another part of the same paper expresses it) it can “be verified by frank inquiry in Scripture”.

Thus he first of all lays down a statement of doctrine—*viz.*, Apostolic Succession through the ministry of the

Episcopate, necessary to the validity of orders and to a valid Eucharist.

Then he furnishes a standard of doctrine—appeal and verification by frank inquiry into the Scripture.

Let us see how Mr. Gore's statement will stand the test of his own standard.

The Immaculate Conception, the Treasury of Merits, Papal Infallibility, are to be rejected because "no candid inquirer could reasonably pretend to find their certificates in the New Testament".

A long list of Catholic theologians, from Scotus to Passaglia and Lambruschini, thought otherwise. A host of universities, colleges and seats of ecclesiastical learning, and a multitude of bishops all over the globe were consulted by Pius IX. before the definition of the Immaculate Conception. These (as did the late Cardinal Newman in his letter to Dr. Pusey) testified their belief that the doctrine finds its justification in Holy Writ. A fairly large number of theologians and bishops were present at the Council of Trent, which approved the doctrine of Indulgences, and at that of the Vatican which defined Papal Infallibility.

All these theologians, universities, bishops, knew that the claims of these doctrines to be defined as an article of faith lie chiefly in the fact that they are explicitly or implicitly contained or indicated in Holy Scripture. In giving their verdict for the definition, they conscientiously believed and asserted that there are many passages of both the Old and the New Testament in which these doctrines are sufficiently mentioned. Still more did they maintain that they were implicitly contained in and required by the structure of the spiritual truths.

Does Mr. Gore ask us to believe that this multitude of presumably learned and religious men—Council of Trent and Vatican as well—must be dismissed as not possessing even one "candid inquirer" who could even "reasonably pretend" to find what he believed he found in Scripture?

But this by the way.

It is not with the Immaculate Conception, or Papal Infallibility, or the Treasury of Merits, that we are just now

concerned, but with Mr. Gore's own statement of belief, and the test or standard which he himself in the same breath enunciated with it. We wish to see how the one fits in with the other.

When Mr. Gore tells the Anglican Church that she must maintain the doctrine of Apostolic Succession and Episcopal Ordination as a necessary condition of a valid Eucharist, he naturally believes by the conditions of his own test that this doctrine is one which has its Scriptural Certificate and is verified by frank inquiry into Scripture.

He says so:—

It cannot, clearly, be discussed as a matter of historical evidence in a fraction of twenty minutes. But I would say this—How any one who, with an open mind, reads the Acts, the Pastoral Epistles, the Epistles of Ignatius, the Epistle of Clement, and the record of the second century tradition as represented by Hegesippus and Irenæus—a body of literature that can be read through in a few hours—can doubt the immense strength of the doctrine of the Apostolic Succession, I am at a loss to imagine.

But, after all, what is the precise value of the above?

It is simply a record of Mr. Gore's mental experience of the impression which a given course of reading has left upon his mind. Also an assurance that he is at a loss to imagine how any one with an open mind could arrive at a different conclusion from that which *he* has found in it.

Now the interest of the religious public is not mainly in any one's personal experiences or in the results of his reading. Rather is it in the determination of principles and in the means and method of arriving at objective religious truth.

No doubt Mr. Gore is satisfied that he sees the doctrine contained in Scripture. That is not the point. But the point is this. When he asks the Anglican body to maintain that doctrine, can he at the same time give it any better guarantee than his own personal insight as to the required Scriptural certificate? Or can he give to the Anglican body any serious reason why *his* reading and views on this particular matter should be accepted and followed preferably to that of other members of the Establishment who, with equal talent and equal sincerity, and with precisely the

same Scriptural and patristic documents under their eyes, have arrived at an exactly opposite conclusion?

Mr. Gore may be at a loss to imagine how they can do so; but then again the point is not what measure of surprise he or we may feel at such a result, but that it is a plain public fact that they do so. And as long as they do so the difficulty of a determinant criterion remains and cannot be got rid of. When it is a question of saying what is or is not contained in Scripture why should the reading of Mr. Gore or Mr. Gore's section of the Anglican Church be accepted rather than that of other people?

Why?

Will the answer be that the doctrine is contained in Scripture so plainly that any one "with an open mind" and "by frank inquiry" can see it there?

If so, there arises a difficulty.

What are we to think of the many pious and learned scholars to be found in the ranks of Lutheranism and of English-speaking dissent? Surely non-Episcopal Protestantism has produced many eminent students of both the Bible and Church History.

It would be easy to call up before our imagination an international and fairly representative committee formed from its ranks—say, Professor Fairbairn and Principal Cave in England, Professors Bruce and Duff in Scotland, Professors Schaff and Briggs in America, Professors Harnack and Weizsäcker in Germany, with writers like Dr. de Pressensé and G. Monod from France. We may say that all of these men and legions of students behind them have made the Bible and early Church History more or less their life-study. Now none of them has found in one or the other the doctrine of Apostolic Succession in the sense in which Mr. Gore expounds it.

Have none of these men an "open mind," and have none of them made a "frank inquiry"?

They have certainly failed to find Mr. Gore's conclusion.

Must they be set aside as incapable or uncandid, and dismissed without consideration like the theologians of Trent and the Vatican?

But to test the working of Mr. Gore's criterion we have no need to go outside his own Communion, nor even outside the walls of the Church Congress.

If it only requires an open mind and a frank inquiry to find in the New Testament the doctrine of Apostolic Succession as a condition for the validity of the Eucharist, how are we to explain the fact that a very large and also a learned section of the Anglican Communion has utterly failed to discover it?

The same platform which sustained Mr. Gore while he read his paper, supported the Anglican Archbishop of Dublin.

He has read the New Testament and presumably the sub-Apostolic writings which Mr. Gore says may be read in a few hours. And yet, so far is he from having found there anything which teaches the need of Apostolic Succession for a valid Eucharist, that he has made, and is ready to make again to-morrow, an offer to the Nonconformists that if they will only go over to Anglicanism he will take their ministers even as they stand, and, without any attempt at re-ordination, send them just as they are to minister the Sacraments in the Anglican Churches!

They must not go to the Nonconformists and ask them to give up everything, when they themselves were not prepared to meet them half-way. That most interesting paper read by Mr. Gore seemed to deal more with the question of home absorption rather than home reunion. It seemed to him almost like the invitation of the spider to the fly. It was his definite opinion that it would be necessary to adopt that course to which Mr. Gore had referred, *and that was to allow all those ministers of other denominations that had been called to the ministry by some solemn rite in other denominations to be accepted without re-ordination.*

The Archbishop's offer is about the most plain and practical way in which he could express the sincerity of his convictions.

But he may, perchance, have in him something of the wild freedom of the Celt—the irresponsibility of the Dis established.

Then let us take a bishop from the very heart of the Church of England.

We find him in the Presidential chair of the Church Congress.

The Bishop of Worcester may be justified in feeling that as an Anglican bishop, and bishop of the diocese in which the Congress was held, he had a right equal to that of Mr. Gore to speak with a representative voice for the Church of England.

He, too, not less than the Protestant Archbishop of Dublin, must have studied the New Testament and the records of early Christianity.

But he, too, has not succeeded in seeing therein a vestige of the conclusion which we are told it only requires an open mind to find in them. He dearly loves Episcopacy, but he has found neither in Scripture nor tradition anything which would lead him to believe that it is necessary for a valid Eucharist.

He asks, in fact, very much the same question we ourselves have been asking, and says:—

I should like to know why the one authority is better than the other. At all events, I claim my right to stand here as a Bishop of the Church, loyal to my principles, firmly believing that Episcopacy is the best form of government, but not conceding—*I never will concede it*—that it is necessary to the validity of the Sacraments.

Is it want of an open mind, or is it the want of a frank inquiry?

There is at least one great authority within the Anglican Communion against whom no one would care to insinuate a lack of either.

The late Bishop Lightfoot gave not a few hours but a lifetime to the work of research on those very Scriptural and early Christian documents which Mr. Gore has cited. He, too, by years of inquiry, arrived at certain conclusions which are stated in his essay on the Christian ministry. He holds that the New Testament gives no "direct and undisputable notices of a localised episcopate in the Gentile Churches". He speaks of the episcopate as a "development in the later years of the Apostolic Age," and adds that even this development was not "simultaneous and equal in all parts of Christendom".

Institutions which are *essential* to the work of the Church may have their powers and prerogatives developed; but they themselves clearly cannot be the fruit of development. If an Institution is necessary it must be perpetual and *ab initio*.

Here his view tallies completely with his famous declaration that "the Church of England has no sacerdotal system and interposes no sacrificial tribe between God and man".

The reader rises from the study of Dr. Lightfoot's works with the conviction that in the author's mind, Episcopacy rests not upon a doctrinal, but upon an historical basis.

These are conclusions which fit in admirably with those of the Bishop of Worcester and the Anglican Archbishop of Dublin, but they would require to be stretched and expanded far beyond the vision and will of Dr. Lightfoot himself before they could be made to cover Apostolical succession as the necessary condition of the validity of the Sacraments.

Thus it seems to us that it is precisely Mr. Gore's own test—the appeal to Scripture—which mercilessly beats down Mr. Gore's own doctrine, when it is set at work under the most favourable circumstances, and within the very pale of his own communion.

But if Mr. Gore maintains his doctrine on the strength of this test, then his position is, to say the least, a remarkable one.

He stands before the religious world, and proclaims the principle—No doctrine to be believed or insisted upon as part of Christian faith unless its certificate can by an open mind and frank inquiry be seen in Scripture.

Then, what happens?

Immediately the multitude of bishops and theologians from Trent and the Vatican crowd into the witness-box and say:—

"We see in the Scriptures and in Scriptural principles contained and indicated the doctrine of Indulgences, the Immaculate Conception and Papal Infallibility."

To these Mr. Gore would make answer:—

"You see too much. You see what is not there. No

candid person could pretend to do so. You may stand down. You are disqualified."

Then their place is taken by the representatives of Lutheran and Dissenting erudition, who cry:—

"We with all the learning and piety at our command, and with full liberty of conscience, have searched the Scriptures, and in vain have we sought in it the doctrine of Episcopacy which you have just professed as something which is written there and must be maintained as part of the Gospel."

To these Mr. Gore would practically reply:—

"You see too little. You cannot see what there is to be seen. Why you cannot, I am at a loss to imagine. If after searching all your lives, you cannot find what should be found in a few hours' reading, you must stand down. You, too, are disqualified."

Finally come surging before him the evangelical masses of his own communion, headed by Anglican bishops, canons, and archdeacons, who say:—

"We yield to no man in our love of Episcopacy, but we have studied the New Testament and the writings you mention, and we are conscientiously convinced that they contain no proof whatever—no scriptural warrant—that Episcopacy is an essential condition for the validity of the Eucharist."

To these would Mr. Gore reply:—

"You do not see enough. You are scripturally short-sighted. You do not see the Scriptural certificate which I can see most plainly. You, too, must give place to those who can see more clearly."

When Mr. Gore has calmly put down some thousands of Catholic bishops and theologians on the right of him—for they see too much in Scripture—and then the multitude of dissenting Protestants on the left—for they see not at all—and finally a whole mass of his own Church in front of him—for seeing not enough—then only just in himself and that section of Anglicanism which agrees with him, shall we find what is left when his test has completed the circle of its sweeping application.

That would mean that a large part of Christendom would

pay a rather severe penalty for not seeing eye to eye with High Church Anglicanism. And then the disqualified world at large may be tempted to ask after all, why should Mr. Gore's intuitions of Scripture be imposed as a rule of faith upon the whole Anglican Communion?

And why should his tenets be proclaimed as something which "*must* be maintained"?

We say so much, not in the least that we dissent from the doctrine of Apostolical succession, as Mr. Gore expressed it, but that we altogether, as Catholics, dissent from the standard by which he holds it, in the way in which he applies it, and because we believe the test, in the sense he proposes it, to be arbitrary, personal, ultra-Protestant, utterly unworkable everywhere, and most of all, in Mr. Gore's own communion.

For there is no logical middle course.

Such issues—whether a given doctrine is or is not contained in Scripture—must always be tried either by the individual conscience upon their own merits, or by a judgment of Church authority. If the first, we have private judgment and undiluted Protestantism—if the second, we cannot send the appeal back to Scripture itself from the Church's judgment on Scripture, without jumping into the other alternative. Nor would Mr. Gore, we assume, require *explicit* mention in Scripture of all doctrines to be held as of faith.

If he did, he would have to part with the *Homoousia* and the *Theotokos*, and much of the work of the first four General Councils.

But, if he admits that the Scriptural certificate of the doctrine may be an *implicit* one—*viz.*, implied in the great truths taught by Scripture—then the difference between him and us is not, so far, one of principle, or that he assigns to Scripture a higher place than we do—but simply between his insight and that of our Councils, and that the Councils of Trent and the Vatican believed that they found in Scripture certain conclusions which Mr. Gore has not found in it—very much as he himself sees there certain conditions of valid Sacraments which Dissenters, and even bishops of his own Church, cannot see in it.

But by Scriptural appeal we fear that he means something more than this—a something which we think places in his hands the banner of Protestantism which we are wont to consider quite safe in the vigilant keeping of men like Archdeacon Farrar.

In a word, we have to ask ourselves, do the extracts which we have cited from Mr. Gore's paper imply that it is lawful for every one to appeal from the *Ecclesia docens* to the text of Holy Scripture?

No Catholic rejects the appeal—the appeal understood as a *recursus*—to the Scripture and to the Fathers. The Church insists upon such an appeal, both as the confirmation of her doctrine, and as a standard which she herself uses in forming her definitions of doctrine.

But an appeal to Scripture *against* the Church and against what she has defined, and as a *corrective* of her authoritative dogmatic teaching, is a totally different case.

Such an appeal is un-Catholic, and for two reasons. First, because the same Holy Ghost Who inspired the sacred writers "abides forever" in the Church, "guiding her to all truth"—*viz.*, guiding her to expound and develop truly and infallibly the "all truth," both written and delivered, which Christ has confided to her.

We cannot appeal from the Holy Ghost guiding the Church to the Holy Ghost inspiring Scripture. God is One. We have precisely the same guarantee for the Church's inerrancy as we have for the inspiration of Scripture.

But, secondly, it is the purest fallacy to suppose in such a juncture that the terms of the appeal are the *Scripture* on one side and the *Church* on the other, and that the appeal runs from the Church as the *judex a quo* to the Scripture as the *judex ad quem*.

That might be conceivably the case if the Church professed to teach a doctrine—say X—purely of her own consciousness, while Scripture said nothing about X, or even excluded it.

But the Church does not profess, and has never professed, anything of the kind. In all that she defines, she professes

to be guided by what is laid down in Scripture, or what is postulated by the truths taught therein. Her definitions are based on her conscientious and divinely guided reading of Scripture, as her dogmatic Bulls and Constitutions abundantly affirm.

Then it is quite clear that when I appeal about the doctrine X to the Scripture, it is the merest assumption to label my case as an appeal to

Scripture *versus* Church.

It is simply an appeal to

My reading of Scripture *versus* the *Church's* reading of Scripture.

If this be Mr. Gore's meaning, which we should be very sorry to misrepresent—his test turns out to be the very ancient and, however much varied, the unique method of heresy from the beginning—the cry of Luther to the Legate, protesting his readiness to submit (*provided* that the Church of God, instead of teaching him, would come down from her chair and argue the matter out with him, and by a disputation, pleading at the bar of *his* individual judgment, would prove to *his* satisfaction that her doctrines are contained in Scripture!).

It is the old, old story of private judgment *versus* Church authority. It is Protestantism of the purest and simplest kind! That is more than we are accustomed to expect from the higher levels of the Anglican Movement.

The whole view of the Anglican Church as revealed by the Congress to an outsider, is that of a Church cleft in two—or shall we say, two Churches living for the time under one roof.

The cheers which greeted Mr. Gore's generous allusion to reunion with Rome, and those which hailed his reference to reunion with Dissent, marked sufficiently well the line of the cleavage.

The spectacle drew from the Protestant Archbishop of Dublin the candid avowal that the chasm between Anglicans themselves was deeper than that which separates Anglicans from outsiders.

(A statement which may be true of the other end of the comparison, but which we feel bound to disclaim for ourselves,

for whatever may be said of points of mere doctrinal or ritual likeness, the highest Anglican Church is immeasurably nearer to the lowest dissenting one than it is to us, and yes is not more clearly cut off from no, nor East farther removed from West, than is that which is Catholic from all that is not Catholic.)

Even the Anglican Bishop of Edinburgh and Professor Stokes not only felt but expressed their conviction that the principles which obtain in the party represented by the Protestant Archbishop of Dublin, are such that any attempt to act upon them in the way he proposed "would rend the Church in two".

Both the speakers and their audience must be logical enough to know that if their words are true, the Church must be *already* rent in two in her conscience and convictions.

Putting chasms and clefts away from our minds, we are tempted to use a higher, if not a happier figure. Astronomers at times draw our attention to some remarkable star that is traversing our firmament. Later on they inform us that what we have seen is not a single or united body, but a double star, *viz.*, in reality a compound object made up of separated parts. Finally, they point out how the narrowing and expanding of the lines on the spectrum analysis denote that the parts are rapidly rushing away from each other, and that one part is rapidly departing into the distance, while the other is as rapidly drawing near to us.

Catholics who have read the reports of the Church Congress will be reminded of the reading of the spectrum, and will watch with prayer and hope the movement of the lines, trusting that grace may happily hasten that glorious process of light and law by which Catholic truth draws towards itself souls that are its own by the sweetest and subtlest and strongest of all attractions.

CHAPTER LVIII.

Anglicanism and the Nestorians.

(17TH MARCH, 1894.)

THE comparative method is not without interest when applied to the study of the various forms of religion.

We proceed to make an experiment. We take as terms of comparison what we shall call the Two Departures.

We use the word "departure" because it is a neutral, and non-question-begging term, and by it we mean the exodus of a body of Christians from the communion of the Apostolic See.

The first of the two is the departure of the Nestorian body, or as they are now commonly called the Assyrian or East Syrian Christians, which took place in the fifth century. The second is the departure of the English Church at the time of the Reformation.

These two points make interesting *foci* for the sweep of comparative deductions. They are about as far apart in date and place as we need care to have them. One is ancient; the other is modern. One is Eastern; the other is Western. There are more than a thousand years of time and more than a thousand miles of space between them.

We choose the Anglican departure to begin with.

There is no need to recapitulate the familiar features of the English Reformation. But for the purpose in view, it will be sufficient to single out a few that will be readily recognised as the most salient and the most influential.

The Reformation in England, as soon as by the death of Henry VIII. it felt itself free to follow its own impulse, shaped itself at once into its true and natural bent, and struck with all its strength at three of the main and popular Catholic doctrines.

These were:—

1. The doctrine of the Mass as a Propitiatory Sacrifice.
2. The doctrine of Purgatory and Prayers and Masses for the Dead.

3. The doctrine of the veneration and invocation of the Blessed Virgin and the Saints.

This triple denial has its witness both in the records of the time and in the texture of the Anglican articles and liturgy.

The denial of the Sacrificial character of the Eucharist—so vehement in the mind and heart and hand of Cranmer—expressed itself in the substitution of a Communion-service for the Sacrifice of the Mass. It was emphasised by the utter deletion from the Prayer-book of the idea of the Eucharist as a propitiatory Sacrifice. It was eloquently brought home to the popular mind by the public removal of the fixed or stone altars, and the significant substitution of mere wooden tables in the midst of the chancel or church, at which plainly robed clergymen ministered without chasuble, lights, or incense.

The second denial was carefully embodied in the Articles.

Article XXI. declared that "the Sacrifices of Masses, in which it was commonly said that the Priest did offer Christ for the quick and the dead to have remission of pain or guilt, were blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits".

It was practically enforced by the suppression of some two thousand chantries, and the complete cessation of the Masses for the Dead which were being daily offered throughout the land.

The third denial was set forth in Article XXII., which affirmed that amongst other things "the Invocation of the Saints was a fond thing, vainly invented, and grounded upon no warranty of Scripture, but rather repugnant to the Word of God". This was abundantly illustrated by the public removal of shrines and images, the deliberate exclusion of the Ave Maria, the Litany of the Saints and all invocatory prayers from the reformed Prayer-book. It was finally supported by an Article (XXV.) specially framed to approve the Homilies, and in these any intercession on the part of Saints is strenuously disputed, and in them it is carefully taught that invoking angels or saints means believing in them, and believing in them is "most horrible blasphemy against God and His Holy Word."¹

¹"So that invocation of prayer may not be made without faith in him on whom they call: but that we must first believe in him, before

So far, we take it, the English Reformers have made their mind and meaning remarkably clear. They have stamped it plainly and indelibly so that all that run may read it upon the face of English history and upon the face of the Anglican formularies.

We turn to the other point of the comparison.

The Nestorian departure from Catholic unity took place in the earlier decades of the fifth century.

When Nestorius and his following were condemned and excommunicated by the General Council of Ephesus, A.D. 431, for denying the unity of Person in Christ, and the prerogative of the Blessed Lady as *Theotokos*, or Mother of God, the sect sought safety in Persia, just outside the lines of the Roman Empire. The anathemas of the Roman Pontiff might run the wide world over, but the sword of the Roman Emperor, which a certain type of the Eastern mind feared very much more than the anathemas, stopped short at the frontier.

Thus Nestorianism stepped across the border, and defied both Pope and Emperor. It found a leader and organiser in Barsumas, who, in A.D. 435, became Bishop of Nisibis. Barsumas sheltered himself under the protection of Pherozes, King of Persia. He won the patronage of the King, by cleverly pointing out the advantages from a civil point of view which would accrue from the existence of a national church which would have its centre of allegiance inside and not outside his own territory. This policy was followed up by a bitter persecution of all who refused to conform to the new sect. As Gibbon expresses it, "Nestorianism was encouraged with the smile and armed with the sword of despotism," and "the blood of 7,700 Catholics, or monophysites, confirmed the uniformity of faith and discipline in the churches of Persia".¹

The work of Barsumas was taken up and continued by

we can make our prayer unto him, whereupon we must only and solely pray unto God. For to say that we should believe either in angel or saint, or in any living creature, were most horrible blasphemy against God and His holy Word . . ."—*Homily on Prayer*.

¹*History of the Decline and Fall*, ch. xlvii. (vol. viii., 341, A.D. 1791).

Babaeus, a married layman who, in A.D. 496, became Bishop of Seleuceia. This prelate, with commendable consistency, lost no time in calling a synod, which sanctioned the marriage of the bishops and clergy.

We should be disposed to describe Barsumas and Babaeus as the Romulus and Remus of Nestorianism in Persia. But as their work was successive and not contemporaneous, we may more correctly say that they were to Nestorianism in the fifth century very much what Thomas Cranmer and Matthew Parker were to Anglicanism in the sixteenth.

Defiance of the See of Rome and the majority of Catholic Christendom—appeal to the interest and ambition of the Civil Power—repudiation of extra-national authority—uniformity enforced by penal coercion—a readiness to bid for domestic solace for the clergy! These are all notes with which we are fairly familiar in the Western Reformation.

Thus, were we to limit our comparison of the two departures to their organic features, we should be ready to admit that there are certain analogies which cannot be said to be wanting.

But when we pass from the organic to compare their doctrinal features, it is by unlikeness rather than by likeness, and by antilogies rather than by analogies that we are confronted.

The object of our inquiry is to ascertain what is the measure of doctrinal resemblance between two terms:—

(A) Nestorianism.

(B) Anglicanism as defined by the Reformation.

To possess ourselves of an accurate notion of Nestorianism as it is and as it was, we shall summon four witnesses.

The first of these will be the more welcome, because he is, if we may so speak, a hostile one.

In 1842 an Anglican clergyman, the Rev. G. P. Badger, was sent by the S.P.C.K., armed with commendatory letters from Archbishop Howley and from the Bishop of London, and devoted several years of missionary labour in Persia to the study of Nestorianism, with the avowed object of bringing about a mutual understanding, a co-operative, if not a

corporate union between the Nestorian Church and his own. He has embodied the results of his experiences and researches in two volumes, entitled *The Nestorians and their Ritual*, a work which has come to be accepted as a standard authority.

But as Mr. Badger, both as a Western and a Protestant, may naturally not be expected to bring to his task upon all points the insight of a Syrian, or even perhaps the expert knowledge of a specialist in liturgiology, we may reinforce his testimony by that of the Assemani, in whom both these qualifications are recognised to be found in a conspicuous degree.

Joseph Simon Assemani was a Syrian Maronite, who in the last century became Archbishop of Tyre, and was keeper of the Vatican Library until his death in 1768. His *Bibliotheca Orientalis* is a monumental work of research which has made his scholarship deservedly one of European reputation. An entire tome of this work (III.) is devoted to a documentary study of the Nestorian Church and its doctrine and worship.

Hardly less celebrated as an authority on Oriental Christianity is Joseph Aloysius Assemani, of the same Syrian family, who was Professor of Syro-Chaldaic in the University of the Sapienza under Benedict XIV., and spent twelve years in travelling in Syria, in the study and collection of liturgical documents. In his *Codex Liturgicus Ecclesie Universalis* he gives us the text of the Nestorian liturgy.

Finally, to secure modernity, and bring our investigation duly up to date, we may avail ourselves of the testimony of the Very Rev. A. J. Maclean, the Anglican Dean of Argyll and the Isles, whose work on the "East Syrian Daily Offices" has been published by the Eastern Church Association only last month.

With these four guides we enter a Nestorian Church to take note of what we shall see and hear in its services.

It is Mr. Badger who points out the significant structure of the building.

"The Stone Altar is fixed against the Wall" (p. 220), and "the Nestorians divide their Church into a *hecla* (temple)

or nave, a *khoros*, or choir or chancel, and a *medhba* (altar), into which no one but the clergy are allowed to enter."

The indication may be but a small one, but it does not point in the direction of the changes made by the English Reformation.

We are present at the ordination of a priest.

The Metropolitan stands in the midst of the chancel, having before him the candidate for ordination.

He addresses him in these words:—

"O priest, how great is thy dignity! For in the sight of Him to whom thou dost minister, the ministers of fire and spirit tremble for reverence.

"Gabriel is glorious, and great is Michael, as their names portend, but compared with thy Priesthood they are exceedingly beneath thee!"¹

This is Sacerdotalism with a very large S. It reminds us at once of the language of St. Chrysostom in the treatise *de Sacerdotio*, and of St. Alphonsus in the *Selva*, or of Père Chaignon in his *Méditations Sacerdotales*, but it is "not," in the least, the language of Cranmer and the authors of the English Reformation.

The Metropolitan, before the solemn words of Ordination, prays over them.

"Strengthen them, O Lord of All, and giver of all Spiritual gifts, so that without stain, they may offer to Thee all day and night peaceful Sacrifices."²

Here there is no evasion of the idea of sacrifice, but a clear allusion to the perpetual oblation foretold by Malachias, to be offered in every place "from the rising of the sun to the going down thereof".

We now enter a church where one of the priests thus ordained is saying the Mass, or the Liturgy—offering the "peaceful sacrifice" and exercising "the ministry of consecration" as the words of his ordination have described it.

¹ *Codex Liturgicus Ecc. Univers.*, J. A. Assemani, vol. xii., 30.

² *Ibid.*

We listen to the words of this offertory :—

“ We offer to Thee this lively, holy, acceptable, glorious and great and awful Sacrament for all men.”¹

And in the prayer of the Commemoration :—

“ The Body of Christ and His precious Blood are upon the Holy Altar.

“ On the Holy Altar let there be a remembrance of Mary the Mother of Christ.”

And before the Communion, the priest says : “ Grant that when Thy holy Body and Blood shall mingle with the bodies and souls of thy servants, they may cleanse us from all the pollution of sin, and deliver us from all evil ”.²

The priest, making the sign of the Cross over the chalice with the Host, is saying : “ The precious Blood is signed with the Holy Body of the Lord Jesus Christ. The Holy Body is signed with the propitiatory Blood of the Lord Jesus Christ.”³

“ Angels and men worship Thee, O Thou High Priest who in the *Sacrifice of the Altar* hast established Thine Incarnation.”⁴

“ And since He is One and Indivisible, above and in the Church, He is *daily sacrificed for our sins*, but without enduring pain. Come, then, and let us in all purity approach the Sacrifice of His All-Hallowing Body, and let us with one accord cry out and say, ‘ Glory be to Thee ’.”⁵

As far as the idea of Propitiatory Sacrifice is concerned, we have here a strong and emphatic affirmation as contrasted with the liturgical denial and elimination of the Revisers of the English Prayer-book.

Can these declarations of the Liturgy be accepted in a purely figurative sense ?

It is undoubtedly true that the Nestorians, like all other sects, have had their innovators, and that amongst them have been found certain bishops and writers who projected the Nestorian error into their conception of the Eucharist,

¹ *Nestorians and their Ritual*, G. P. Badger, ii., 232. ² *Ibid.*, 218.

³ J. S. Assemani, *Bibliotheca Orientalis*, tome iii., part ii., 293.

⁴ Service in the Khudhra for seven Sundays in Lent, given in *Nestorians and their Ritual*, ii., 139.

⁵ Service in the Khudhra for Holy Thursday, *ibid.*

and held that Christ made the bread to be His Body, just as He made His Body to be His own, by a mere moral union and without changing its nature. Such an error, if it meant anything, would mean that the Eucharist was an extension of the Incarnation in the degrading sense of an Impanation.

But Joseph Simon Assemani well points out that this opinion was far from being either the belief or the traditional teaching of the Nestorian bishops and theologians. On the contrary, the authoritative voice of their Patriarchs sets forth the doctrine of the Eucharist with startling clearness.

Thus both Mr. Badger and J. S. Assemani cite the following testimony from *The Jewel*, a standard treatise of Nestorian theology, dealing with the Seven Sacraments, and written by Mar-abd-Yeshua, who was Nestorian Metropolitan of Nisibis and Armenia in A.D. 1298.

“Through this Divine Institution the bread is changed into His holy Body and the wine into His precious Blood; and they impart to all who receive them in faith and without doubting the forgiveness of sins, purification, enlightenment, pardon, the great hope of resurrection from the dead, the inheritance of heaven and the new life. Whenever we approach these Sacraments we meet with Christ Himself, and His Very Self we take into our hands.”

[Christ in the heart, and not in the hand of the believer, was a watchword of English Reformed theology, as it is still amongst Evangelicals.]

“And kiss, and thereby we are joined to and with Christ, His holy Body mixing with our bodies and His pure Blood mingling with our blood, and by faith we know Him that is in the Heaven, and Him that is in the Church to be one Body.”¹

The same Assemani and also Renaudot quote the words of the Patriarch Elias III., who in his Exposition of the Faith says:—

“The *substance* of the bread and wine are changed into the substance of the Body and Blood of Christ.”²

.

¹ J. S. Assemani, *Bibliotheca Orientalis*, tome iii., part ii., 291; G. P. Badger, *Nestorians and their Ritual*, ii., 411.

² Renaudot, *Liturgia Orient.*, ii., 577 and 615; J. S. Assemani, *Bibliotheca Orientalis*, tome iii., part ii., 29.

Let us now suppose that the priest whom we have seen ordained, and ministering at the altar, has died. We enter the Nestorian Church to assist at his funeral. The Liturgy or Mass is being offered for his soul.

The following are portions of the service which reach our ears :—

“ Have mercy upon us, O Thou Who art glorified of all, through the intercession of the martyrs, Mar Gheorgees and Mar Serghees, and of St. Mary the Blessed, who put away all devouring insects, frost and death who destroy all, and who became a Mother and Parent to the Son of the Lord of all. . . .”

“ On this day may the souls of thy servants mix in glory and blessedness with Elijah and Enoch. . . .”¹

In the service which follows there is a beautiful texture of processional chants and responses, and by a picturesque liturgical fiction, one of the parts in the chant is made to represent the dead priest, and another the mourning people. The voice of the deceased is thus heard, as it were, at his own funeral, reminding his bereaved flock how he has ministered to them in the House of God, and plaintively appealing to them, in words which have much of the thrilling pathos of the *Miseremini Mei* of our own Requiem Mass, not to forget him, but to make “ constant remembrance of him in their prayers ” and “ at the altar,” so that he may speedily be admitted into “ the bright light of the Nuptial Chamber of the Blessed ”.²

For instance, we hear the following in snatches, as they bear the body to the grave.

“ O my brethren, companions, and dearly beloved, with those of my ministry, forget not to remember me in the Holy Church. . . .”

“ Depart in peace, thou pure priest, who didst minister well in the Church below, behold thou shalt put on glory in the Church that is above. . . .”

“ O ye fathers and pastors, remember me what time the Sacrament of the Body and Blood is offered up. . . . Sup-

¹ G. P. Badger, *Nestorians and their Ritual*, i., 232.

² *Ibid.*, vol. ii., Appendix.

plicate for me in your prayers, ye that stand in the Holy Place, that the Body and Blood of the Lord may plead for me."

"Give rest, O Lord, to the soul of Thy servant who has slept in Thy hope. For in the bridal-chamber of light thy crown shines, among the Saints, thou pure priest of the Lord and lover of Christ" (Service of the Kahneita, or Burial of Priests, given by Mr. Badger, *op. cit.*, vol. ii., 307).

Could anything be more unlike a Protestant funeral, or farther apart from the spirit and teaching and practice of the English reformers?

While we witness this service, which is in itself a splendid Liturgical proclamation of the belief in the efficacy of Mass and Prayer for the dead, let us seek to arrive at an exact appreciation of its doctrinal meaning as held and taught by the Nestorians.

Assemani puts into our hand the treatise which the Nestorian Patriarch, Timothy II., has written on the Seven Sacraments, and in the sixth chapter of which (sec. 7) he answers the objections of those who ask "Why, if each one receives the fruit of his labour, should there be prayers and sacrifices for the dead?"

The Patriarch gives three reasons. Like a wise rhetorician, he puts the best one last, and clenches his proof in the great fact that Christ died for *both* the living and the dead. Whereupon he continues:—

"It is therefore obvious, that it is not without profit and use that there is the Sacrifice of the Lamb of the Living God, Who taketh away the sin of the world, when it is offered for the living and the dead. . . . Useful, therefore, and profitable it is that for us should be constantly immolated the Lamb of God, both for those who are partakers of the Sacrament of Immolation, and for him on whose account and for whom it is perfected and consummated."¹

The "Lamb of God, constantly immolated" in the Sacrament of the Eucharist, to take away the sins of "the living

¹ J. S. Assemani, *Bibliotheca Orientalis*, tome iii., part ii., 344.

and the dead," seems to us to be a remarkably clear and full statement of that very idea of Propitiatory Sacrifice which the Reformers so vehemently struck out of the English Prayer-book.

The funeral is over, and we are back in the Nestorian Church to take part in another function.

It is a festival of Our Lady, and service is being held in her honour.

The priest is come to declare her praise to the people, and the Nestorian liturgy, to make sure of his doing it properly, carefully provides a special formulary and a prescribed eulogium for the purpose.

The following is what we hear from the celebrant:—

"The mouths of men are insufficient to praise the Mother of the Lord of Angels and of men. Those in the body fall short nor can the spiritual ones attain unto it. If she be so great and exalted, how can vile lips declare her? . . .

"Grant me, therefore, that I may magnify Thy Mother before Thy Church and before Thy people."

Forthwith the words of the service proceed to apply to our Blessed Lady no less than twenty-two of the Psalms of David, which are interpreted as foretelling her sublime prerogatives. In doing so, it does not hesitate to describe her to the people as "the one who delivered our race".

It continues:—

"She whose Son is the Heaven of Heavens, who will say that any one can be compared to her?

"The morning stars worshipped her, and the Sun and Moon bowed their heads to her. The Heavens called her Blessed, and the Heaven of Heavens joined in her beatitude. The Apostles bore her body; the prophets and priests followed her bier, the Angels wore crowns for her, and the mouths of fire extolled her. The sick and afflicted called upon her name, and when she rested (died) her prayers were a tower of help to all the distressed."

It then represents the Angels as saluting her in these words:—

"Blessed art thou, since through thee salvation from destruction has come to Adam and to his children!"

It adds :—

“ May the Virgin’s prayers be a wall of defence to all the world which commemorates her festival with great rejoicing ! ”

The whole of this service which reminds one of the oration of St. Cyril of Alexandria or the hymns of St. Ephrem, is given by Mr. Badger, at p. 52 of the second volume of his *Nestorians and their Ritual*. If any reader will consult the work in full, he will rise from its perusal feeling that in the veneration of her who is “ Blessed amongst women ” and in the chorus of love and praise by which all generations “ call her Blessed,” it is rather the East than the West that leads the way, and that this Nestorian service contains expressions of honour and homage, which are unheard in the land of the Madonna, and for which we should look in vain in *Glories of Mary* by St. Alphonsus.

With these testimonies before us we think that we are safe in saying that noonday light is not further apart from midnight darkness, nor summer heat from winter frost, than religion such as we see it here presented from that which was introduced into this land by the English Reformation.

At a lecture delivered at Glasgow in behalf of the Anglican mission to the Nestorian or Assyrian Christians, the Chairman read the following letter from the Archbishop of Canterbury :—

ADDINGTON PARK,
CROYDON, 24th November, 1893.

MY DEAR PROFESSOR,—I am very happy and grateful to hear, in answer to my request to you, of the preparations for such a meeting on behalf of the mission to the Assyrian Christians. We do not commonly call them the “ Assyrian Church ” because of their formal separation from the Church on account of their Nestorian heresy once held, but now there is no trace of it discernible in their teaching or views. Their three Liturgies are so ancient (and markedly older one than another) that the most modern of the three contains no trace of Nestorianism, and is therefore certainly older than the fourth century. At present they (*e.g.*, the Metropolitan, a well-read man) are horrified at the imputation to them of those strange opinions which are attributed to Nestorius, although they still make his name their own. This is why we call them “ Assyrian Christians ” at present rather than “ Church ”—“ Assyrians ” we call them from

their locality as a well-known region, but they would more technically be called East Syrians. *They are to us wonderful evidences of the value and accuracy of the Reformation. They hold all our Christian doctrines and they know nothing of transubstantiation, of mariolatry,¹ or invocation of saints, or purgatory.*

“They know nothing of Invocation of the Saints”!

But the following is the prayer set forth in all plainness on the face of the Nestorian Liturgy. It occurs in the Burial Service for priests. Mr. Badger gives it in vol. ii., p. 309, in these terms:—

“O Mary, Sainted Virgin, Mother of Jesus, our Saviour, plead and supplicate for mercy for sinners who flee to thy prayers, that they may not be lost. Let thy prayers be to us a wall of defence in this world and in that which is to come.”

Again:—

“O thou Holy Virgin, through whom our race, corrupted by the deceitfulness of sin, was sanctified, pray with us to thy Sanctifier to sanctify us, that through the shadow of thy prayers, He may preserve our life, and spread the wings of His pity over our frailty. O Mother of Him who causes us to live, thou handmaid of our Creator, be to us a wall of defence at all times.”

From the Nestorian Khudhra (Mr. Badger, vol. ii., 139).

But the most marvellous part of this matter remains to be seen.

We turn to the testimony of the latest witness—the Anglican Dean of Argyll and the Isles, who was himself a

¹ Mr. Badger at times allows his zeal for Anglicanism somewhat to bias his judgment, so much so that even his Anglican editor takes him to task, and thinks that in discovering points of harmony between the Nestorian Church and his own, he displays “amazing ingenuity”. Yet not even Mr. Badger could bring himself to acquit his Nestorian friends of what he calls mariolatry. He says that by withholding the title *Theotokos*, “they do not intend to detract aught from the blessedness of the Virgin Mary,” and, “if they have erred in this respect, the error lies in a tendency to mariolatry, of which they can hardly be pronounced innocent by the most lenient judgment” (vol. ii., p. 70). In measuring the limits of leniency in human judgment, Mr. Badger had not reckoned apparently on the Archbishop of Canterbury.

fellow-worker at Urmi with the very missionaries sent to the Nestorians by the Archbishop of Canterbury. His work just published on the Nestorian daily offices receives a special authentication from the fact that it has been printed and issued under the auspices of the Anglican "Eastern Church Association".

Let us quote a few words from the Secretary's introduction (the italics are ours):—

"The aim of the Association is to disseminate as accurate information as is possible about the Eastern Churches, whether concerning their history and formal teaching or their actual condition. The time has gone by when it is wise to be satisfied with half-truths or incorrect and one-sided information. *There are no books which show more accurately the historical and doctrinal position of a Church than its Liturgies and other services.*"

We turn to these services as given in this work, and on pp. 4, 24 and 28, we find the following prayer in the ferial evening services:—

"O Mary, who didst bear the medicine of life to the children of Adam. In thy petition we will take refuge."
 "O Mary, the Holy Virgin, Mother of Jesus, our Saviour. May thy prayer be a refuge." "O Glorious and Holy Martyr, St. Cyriac, the illustrious, beg mercy for us from thy Lord. That we may be made worthy of the forgiveness of trespasses."

If this be not Invocation of the Saints, what is?

Now this very translation professes to be based amongst others on the text of the Nestorian services, just published by the press which the Archbishop of Canterbury has established at Urmi.

Here, then, we have a situation almost too ludicrous for belief.

On the one hand, we have the Archbishop of Canterbury's press at Urmi, busily publishing for the Nestorians their own liturgical prayers in which they invoke Our Blessed Lady and the Saints. We have the Anglican Dean of Argyll, and the Anglican "Eastern Church Association," carefully translating these very prayers for the information of the British public.

On the other hand, we have the Archbishop himself assuring the same British public that the Nestorians, for whom he asks their sympathies and support, "know nothing of the Invocation of the Saints"!

It is surely incredible that the Archbishop can stand, as it were, with one hand busily printing and distributing invocatory prayers to the Blessed Virgin and the Saints at Urmi in the East, while with the other he writes a letter to assure a Glasgow audience that the Nestorians know nothing of any such practice of invocation!!

That there may or must be some explanation of the phenomenon we cannot in courtesy doubt. We can only say that we do not possess it.

In *The Church Times* of 2nd February (the day after the Secretary of the Eastern Church Association wrote his preface to the Dean of Argyll's work) the Archbishop of Canterbury is reported as speaking of the Nestorian movement as follows:—

When it was said that we had forsaken ancient doctrines and usages, was it not a most glorious thing to be able not only to test by scholarly investigation, but actually to be able to say "on the other side of the world here is a Church which has existed from the beginning, and which has exactly the same usages as those which our reformers arrived at". He did not think that in any age there had been produced a more complete and perfect test of the reality of the primitive character of the English Church. As regarded their superstitions, it could not be said that they were such as clogged the spirit of religion, and were not altogether dissimilar to those which existed in this country.

We think that the Nestorian liturgy and service-books certainly convey a great and significant message to the Christians of the West. The Reformers taught about as clearly and as emphatically as they taught anything, that the Real Presence, the Propitiatory Sacrifice of the Mass, Prayers for the Dead and Invocation of the Blessed Virgin and the Saints were mediæval corruptions imposed upon Christianity by the Church of Rome.

The fact that these doctrines are enshrined in the liturgy of a religious body which separated from us in the fifth

century, and has remained for 1,300 years outside the sphere of Papal jurisdiction, teaches us with telling clearness that their origin cannot be " mediæval " nor of " Papal imposition ".

That is the lesson of the Eastern Liturgies.

But it happens to be just the opposite of the one which is taught by the Archbishop of Canterbury.

CHAPTER LIX.

An Anglican Conception of Church Unity.

(11TH AUGUST, 1894.)

THE Bishop of Salisbury, in a recent Visitation charge, has desired to prove that the Anglican Communion is really a part of the true Church of Christ.

The mere mention of the thesis carries our minds back to our Catechism and to the later part of the Nicene Creed.

"The Church has four marks by which we may know her: She is One—she is Holy—she is Catholic—she is Apostolic."

Thus, when the Bishop seeks to prove his point, we feel that he ought to do so by showing that these four marks—Unity, Holiness, Catholicity and Apostolicity—are the distinguishing features of the Communion to which he belongs.

He proposes to do so.

He begins with Unity.

Amongst those who have had the advantage of listening to his charge, it is by no means impossible that there may have been some who were present at the meetings of a recent Church Congress. They will have had still in their ears the impressive words of a distinguished Anglican authority who proved that reunion with the Dissenting bodies ought not to present any insuperable difficulty from the simple fact that the divisions which separate Anglicanism from Dissenters are not nearly so great as the divisions which exist between Anglicans themselves.

They can hardly have been less interested now to hear from the lips of another authority—equally Anglican and

equally distinguished—the explanation of the way in which such a condition of things is found to be consistent with the note of Unity as required by the Nicene Creed.

Then, Anglican Unity is a matter upon which, even upon *à priori* grounds, Catholics are apt to be somewhat incredulous. They do not believe that Unity can emerge from a system founded on the exercise of private judgment, any more than they could believe in the squaring of the circle.

They feel that Church Unity has for its parents the two principles, Authority and Infallibility, and that only a bastard unity can be born from any other.

When, therefore, the Bishop of Salisbury undertakes to prove his case—if we may be permitted the use of the figure—by leaping the Nicene hurdles, we recognise that one of the highest and hardest is that which has been placed immediately in front of him. Catholics, as well as the public generally, may be pardoned if they look on with some degree of curiosity to see how he will clear it.

But, first of all, let us guess.

When a rider finds his progress barred by a hurdle which he cannot surmount, must he needs turn back?

Not necessarily.

He may do one of three things.

He may ask to have the hurdle lowered to the level of his jumping power.

Thus the Bishop of Salisbury may simply require that the idea of Unity be brought down to meet the exigencies of the Anglican position. The framers of the Creed, we know, meant Unity honestly so called, namely, Unity in belief of all that Our Lord taught—or as we express it, Unity in all things which are of faith.

The Bishop is one who in the higher sense of the term takes up the "Eastward position". We have an impression, therefore, that he would hardly like to affirm before his Greek or old Catholic friends that such doctrines as the objective presence of Christ in the Eucharist, the Sacrificial and Propitiatory character of the Mass, the Divine institution of Episcopacy, the Sacramental validity of priestly

absolution, the efficacy of prayers and Masses for the dead, are not integral parts of the Catholic faith. But to insist upon Unity in these is putting the hurdle at a height at which the Anglican Church could not climb—could hardly see over it. A certain group in the English Church Union might do so, but the body of the Establishment would certainly remain behind. Hence, the hurdle must be lowered. But how far? Let us say—having regard to all who are to pass over it—to belief in the Divinity of Christ; or, if that be too dogmatic, to Loyalty to the person of Christ. At that level, any one who even calls himself a Christian may just step across it. People who note its lowliness may well marvel why any one should have taken the trouble to put it there at all.

(Even Mr. Gladstone, who brought the tact of a statesman to the work of a theologian, and kept one eye upon the consideration of principles and the other upon the consideration of men and actual facts, sought to bring both to a focus, would have taken it upon himself to fix the limit of orthodoxy not lower than the Trinity and the Incarnation.)

But there is another way.

The rider may ask that the hard and solid material of the hurdle be exchanged for one of tissue-paper or some other quasi-non-resisting medium, which a skilful horseman, with a taste for acrobatics, might leap through at pleasure. The Bishop may seek to change the Nicene Mark into a mere Paper Unity, *viz.*, a gross or mechanical Unity which attempts to make men one by causing them to sign or use the same written formularies while each one is left free to accept them in his own meaning. Thus an Evangelical and a Ritualistic clergyman both use the same Prayer-book. One believes that the Mass is a “blasphemous fable,” the other believes that he is saying it. One believes that in the Eucharist there is no Real Presence of Christ outside the mind of the communicant. The other believes that such a conception of the Eucharist is “damnable heresy”.

It would be the merest evasion to speak of such an agreement as Unity. It is at most material—not even mental—conformity. The Unity is in the paper, and in the sounds

and shapes of words and letters of dead formularies and liturgies.

Catholic Unity is in the soul and in the belief. It would not be living, or real, or genuine, if it were not. It makes one in truth the minds of its believers. It is Soul Unity as distinguished from Paper Unity.

We cannot believe in the innate honesty of the English mind—much less in so much that is sincere and conscientious in the Anglican movement—without believing that both are bound to recoil with contempt from so pitiful a subterfuge as Paper Unity. To imagine that *that* was the Unity which Christ prayed for, would be to credit Our Divine Lord with a standard of sincerity immeasurably short of that which we could find in Strauss or Voltaire, and a large proportion of our anti-Christian contemporaries.

But there is yet another way.

The rider may plead that the hurdle be removed for the nonce.

He may say: "Carry it to the other end of the field. Place it somewhere near the goal. If I cannot pass over it now, I can keep it in view, and at least, it will be something stimulating to look forward to. Who knows if, in the velocity acquired towards the end of the race, I may not be able to clear it."

So the Bishop may argue that Unity is indeed a beautiful mark of the Church of Christ—far too beautiful, in fact, for the present condition of mankind—but that it is one which belongs to the Church of the future. It is the term of a gradual *perfectionnement*—a feature of final consummation. It is a mistake to expect at the beginning, or more than in an inchoate measure during the course of the Church's life, a result which was to be fully achieved only towards the end. When Christ prayed that His Church might be one, He was thinking of some period more or less near to the Day of Judgment!

That removes the high hurdle on to a distance where neither the Bishop nor ourselves will be able to see the jumping of it.

The Lowering-Method !

The Paper-Method !

The Future-Method !

These are the three expedients which might be used by a perplexed rider to get rid of the Nicene hurdle.

Which of these will commend itself to the Bishop of Salisbury ?

It seems to us that, with a strange disregard of the incompatible in strategy, he in a manner tries all three.

The following is his proof that Anglicanism possesses the mark of Unity :—

I ventured further to assert that in this Church we had a type of Christianity worthy to take its place by the side of the Greek and Roman Churches, using those names also in a sense wider than the mere local meaning could convey. The "notes" of this great body I described in words, which I will paraphrase and enlarge rather than repeat, dividing them under the four usual heads—Unity, Holiness, Catholicity and Apostolicity.

The English Church then has the true Scriptural note of unity, because it aims at and (as far as human frailty permits) possesses the "unity of the spirit" (Eph. iv. 3), the unity of personal loyalty to our one Master and Saviour, that unity of which Our Blessed Lord speaks when He says, "Be not ye called Rabbi, for one is your Master even Christ, and all ye are brethren" (St. Matt. xxiii. 8, etc.).

That is clearly a case of the Lowering-Method.

It strikes at the very idea and purpose of Revealed Christianity, because it deliberately separates the Divine Teacher from His own Teaching, and seeks to establish Christian Unity in a relation to the former alone, and not to both. If we are to be Christ's disciples, assuredly we must be one in His Word, and in the truths taught, and therefore in the meaning in which Christ taught them, and not merely in personal loyalty to the Teacher Himself. Two minds made one by believing the same body of divinely revealed Truth have "Unity of the spirit". If they do not believe what Christ taught and in the true meaning in which He taught it, it is a non-dogmatic Unity—a "Unity of Spirit" without Unity of mind and conviction ; just the last thing in the world which Christ and the framers of the Creed could have intended.

And here the Bishop is bound to take note of a difficulty. He cannot forget that close upon his heels ride the leaders of Dissent and the hosts of Polychurchism. The Bishop of Salisbury (although he is writing upon Church Unity) is *not* Dr. Perrowne, Bishop of Worcester, nor even Dr. Trench, Anglican Archbishop of Dublin. He very properly intends that his four marks shall not be common to himself and the Nonconformists. He knows that marks are meant to mark off the Church from bodies which are not the Church, and that marks would hardly be marks at all if they covered everybody not only inside the Church but outside of it.

Wherefore, it behoves him, even from his own point of view, to see that the hurdle is not laid too low. To answer his purpose it must be kept at a height at which he and the Anglican Communion can get safely over, while Dr. Lunn, Dr. Parker, and Mr. Hugh Price Hughes may not be able to follow him. That, no doubt, would require just a miracle of adjustment.¹

But we submit that the Bishop has left the miracle utterly unattempted. If "Personal loyalty to Christ" be the bond of union, we fail to see why it should apply more palpably to the Anglican than to the Dissenter. It is a mark at the mention of which the Calvinist, the Methodist, the Lutheran all have the right to hold up their hands. All claim to be personally loyal to Christ as their Master. If this be Catholic Unity, the Society for promoting the Reunion of Christendom may sing a *Te Deum* and dissolve, for Unity is already achieved, and—better still—no such thing as Christian disunion ever existed!

So far, therefore, we take it that the Bishop's proof would be absolutely inadequate even for his own purpose.

¹ The "Lambeth Quadrilateral"?

There is only one side of the Quadrilateral which could in any sense shut out the Dissenter—the "Historic Episcopate". But this, on Bishop Lightfoot's own showing, cannot be an Article of Faith at all, and is at most a mere matter of post-Revelation discipline. Wherefore, on Anglican grounds, it cannot be erected into an essential matter of Church unity. Nor can it avail as a test. Does the Historic Episcopate mean Episcopacy as a *Divine* Institution? If so, there are Anglican Bishops who deny it. If not, there are Dissenters and Presbyterians who affirm that they would find no difficulty in admitting it.

But the Bishop means more than this, and hastens to state it as follows:—

We aim, not only at organic and external unity, on which we set a high value, but also at a moral unity, a unity of conviction, a unity of belief, a unity of willing federation, representation and contract. We do not forget that persistent adherence to tradition, or loyalty to and dependence on a visible centre of authority, have had, and still have, a most important place in the Church. The Greek Church owes much to the first, the Roman to the second.

“Moral Unity, a Unity of conviction, a Unity of belief.”

Here, then, at last we are face to face with genuine, honest Unity. Not Verbal or Paper Unity, but Catholic Unity, in which souls are made one by sharing the same truths, the same beliefs, the same convictions.

And Anglicanism has it?

Alas! the *mirage* floats before us.

The Bishop is careful. Speaking of that low measure of Unity which, as we have seen, avails nothing as a mark, he spoke of “possessing”. But now that he comes to the higher ground of real and distinctive Unity, he changes his verb. He lays down “to possess” and takes up “to aim at”.

Anglicanism does not possess this Unity. Anglicanism “*aims*” at it.

We do not aim at things which we have, but at things which, at present, we have not. When the Bishop says “We aim,” he makes a confession. We cannot but suppose that he would gladly have used the stronger word if it had been given him to do so.

Truth and evidence clear as noonday forbade that he should go beyond “We aim,” and he has loyally refused to go farther, even though he must have known that, as a penalty, he leaves unsaid the only possible word which could prove his thesis. For even a child will understand that a religious body does not bear the marks of the true Church by merely “aiming” at them, but by having them.

And, in point of fact, how could the Bishop speak of “Unity of belief” or “Unity of conviction” in the Anglican body in any other terms?

We have already mentioned five doctrines:—

1. The Objective presence of Christ in the Eucharist.
2. The Sacrificial and Propitiatory Character of the Mass.
3. The Divine Institution of Episcopacy.
4. The Sacramental Validity of Priestly Absolution.
5. The efficacy of Prayers and Masses for the Dead.

Both East and West proclaim these dogmas as main and essential features of the Christian faith.

A Greek or Russian bishop would raise his eyebrows just as promptly and just as highly as any Latin one in scandalised astonishment if assured that any man who denied these doctrines could claim to be called a Catholic.

But upon them one section of the Anglican body believes emphatically yes, while the other section believes emphatically no. And the cleft divides the whole body from the Bench of Bishops downwards—bishop against bishop—clergy against clergy—laity against laity.

They stand divided as to the very meaning of the Communion they celebrate, of the Sacraments they administer, and of the very Episcopacy and priesthood they claim to possess.

In the teeth of this patent public and national fact (and with a Church Congress held annually to keep the public in mind of it), there can be no possible plea of Anglican "Unity of conviction".

We might go farther.

Outsiders at least cannot discover that these two sections show any practical signs of aiming at unity or reunion. On the contrary, there was perhaps never a time when each section was more clear and resolute in holding its respective set of convictions, more articulate in expressing them, more strongly and actively organised in pressing them upon the acceptance of their adherents.

Has the English Church Union, and the clergy and laity it represents, even the remotest intention of abjuring the five doctrines we have enumerated and going back to the Reformation? Has the Protestant Alliance, or the societies which continue their work, and the Protestant masses generally, the remotest intention of accepting them and surrendering the Reformation?

Which of the two may be expected to move towards the other, at a moment when both, by the very measure of their zeal and earnestness, are daily drifting farther apart?

Time will not narrow, but widen the breach between them.

If this be a correct reading of facts, it is not easy to see how in any practical sense these two main sections of Anglicanism can be said, save in the merest platonic sense, to be even "aiming" at "Unity of conviction".

Aiming at unity would mean that their paths should point at closer convergence. As a matter of plain fact, they are pointed at wider divergence.

But let us allow the Bishop to continue:—

We ourselves necessarily feel the value of these things, and cling tenaciously to the Creeds and Sacraments and to the historic Episcopate, and find the practical centre of our organisation in a federation round the Primacy of Canterbury.

Here at once we are diverted from future "aims," and turned back to the pitiful Paper-Method.

"Creeds, Sacraments, Historic Episcopate," the same upon paper, and expressed by the same sounds and letters, but accepted in senses as widely and diametrically different as yes and no in the mind of the individual!

Unity on the paper, and Unity on the lips, but no Unity in the souls of the believers!

No "Primacy of Canterbury" or elsewhere could ever be seriously mentioned as a centre or guarantee of Church Unity unless it were possessed of *effective* authority for maintaining it. The Archbishop of Canterbury possesses absolutely no power for the purpose. Were any of his suffragans to preach and inculcate every one of the doctrines we have mentioned, the Archbishop is absolutely powerless to restrain him. If another of his suffragans in the neighbouring diocese chose to ridicule and denounce every one of these doctrines, the Archbishop is equally powerless to inhibit him. No one knows better than Dr. Benson what would be the effect of his attempting to issue an injunction of any kind to any bishop of the Anglican Communion either in the United States or in the Colonies.

A centre without control would be a lame and a ludicrous contrivance for holding a Church in Unity.

The Bishop concludes :—

But we do not think such formal and organic ties, essential as they are, exhaust the Scriptural idea of Unity, or are, indeed, its most important parts. They are necessary means to an end, but it is a mistake to insist so much on what is merely useful and convenient in them as to make it essential, as both these Churches in their different ways seem to do. We believe that our ideal of Unity represents the ideal of the future, if theirs, in some degree, represents the discipline and experience of the past.

And here, again, we are back at the Future-Method !

Apparently, when Our Lord prayed for Unity, He meant not one thing but two. First, an old-fashioned Unity which was to last only for a time, and which the Greek and the Roman Churches were to use for the first nineteen centuries. But in the nineteenth century a new kind of Unity was to be discovered by the Catholic Church, and this was to be taken up, perpetuated and promoted by the Anglican Communion on to the end.

We hold a Report of the English Church Union in one hand, and a Report of the English Church Association in the other, and it seems to us that the New Unity is not nearly so much like what ordinary people understand by Unity as the old one.

Can the Bishop of Salisbury seriously mean that the Catholic Church waited for nineteen hundred years and then found out a new form of Church Unity—one different, say, from that which animated the first Four General Councils when they taught the doctrines of the faith, with authority, and said anathema to all who would presume to teach them in any other sense than that in which they had defined them ?

The Future-Method refutes itself by its opposition to the very purpose of a Church-Mark.

Our Divine Lord expressly says that the Unity which He prays for His Church is to be to her a distinguishing mark, so that "the world may know and may believe" that His Heavenly Father had sent Him. If Unity is the divinely

set seal of the Church's mission, she is bound to wear it during the whole course of her history.

Railway officials hang a sign-board upon a train, in order that passengers may know the right one, and avoid being carried in the wrong direction. The sign-board is put up at the beginning—not at the end—of the journey. According to the Future-Method of conceiving Church Unity, the sign-board should be hung up just as the train is arriving at the terminus! Truly, a little too late for those who looked for it to tell them whether the train was the right or the wrong one.

Nor is the method historically true.

If it were, we might look back along the ages to see Christendom proceeding from a looser into a more compact bond of unity, and gradually coalescing into one massive whole.

But the evolution is exactly the opposite.

Perfect unity, as we read in the Acts of the Apostles, is found at the very beginning. Gradually, by schism and heresy, large masses of Christendom are periodically detached, and these, while leaving Unity still perfect in the parent mass, become more and more disintegrated into fragments.

The facts are the refutation of the theory.

Such then is the Bishop of Salisbury's treatment of the first Nicene Note of the Church as applied to Anglicanism.

It was not his to be able to challenge the world's attention to the marvellous and majestic Unity of the Catholic Church, and to say, "Behold here a centre of Unity that dates from the Apostles—Behold here a Hierarchy of more than 1,200 bishops—Behold here more than a quarter of a million of clergy—Behold here more than two hundred millions of people of 'all nations'—and yet all, Pope, Pastors, Priests and People, absolutely one in belief, one in worship, one in loving obedience to the same authority. All ye that pass by the way, look and see how the Church of Christ, like Truth, is beautiful in its oneness!"

The Bishop's task was a different one.

To the Catholic reader his arguments may seem to contain little but the emptiness of phrases, and platitudes which sometimes read like actual evasions.

But let us realise for a moment his position.

It was his to sit down at his desk and to write a paragraph stating and proving the "Unity of the Anglican Church," and to do so, while, figuratively speaking, Bishop Ryle of Liverpool stood at his right, and Bishop King of Lincoln upon his left, and Canon Knox-Little in front of him, and Archdeacon Farrar behind him! His problem was not only to prove the existence of Unity, but of a Unity which would cover his surroundings!

Placed in such a position and given such an impossible task, who is there amongst us who could have acquitted himself more successfully?

Far be it from us to seek satisfaction in the sight of Anglican divisions. Our hopes and interests lie far more in their reunion than disunion. But even as we yearn and pray for the reunion of Christendom, so must we ever deprecate above all things, both for our own sake and for others, anything which would lower or impair the sacred and Catholic ideal of Christian Unity, and debase the purity of the gold upon the matchless vesture of the King's Daughter.

CHAPTER LX.

Archbishop Benson on St. German of Auxerre.

(13TH OCTOBER, 1894.)

ARCHBISHOP BENSON in October, 1894, was called upon to preach in the Church of St. German in Cornwall. He very properly yielded himself to the spirit of the place, and preached a historical sermon. His subject was the life of St. German of Auxerre.

The situation at once becomes invested with a very peculiar interest. For, as soon as we learn that an Anglican Archbishop is going to deal with St. German of Auxerre, every educated Catholic naturally asks himself: "How will the Archbishop reckon with Prosper of Aquitaine?" If the preacher and St. German could only be left to themselves, all might go well, at least for the preacher, for while the

Saint must be silent the preacher can say what he will. But it is just here that Prosper of Aquitaine insists upon making himself an awkward third. St. German historically holds his peace. But Prosper has written a contemporary chronicle, and therefore speaks to all students of history, and speaks with a voice which all the preachers in Christendom cannot drown.

We have thus before us the three *dramatis personæ*—the Archbishop, the Saint, and the Chronicler.

The Archbishop, preaching in Cornwall upon St. German of Auxerre, could not, even if he wished it, avoid alluding to the most salient event of the Saint's life, his mission to Britain. In 429 the Pelagian heresy was rife in many parts of this country. The British Bishops felt urgent need of preachers to help them in the arduous work of converting the heretics.

They applied for aid to the neighbouring Catholic Church in Gaul. Help came—not once but twice—and on each occasion the great champion and foremost missionary in the restoration of the faith of the British Church was St. German of Auxerre. Thus the mission of St. German is one of the best and brightest chapters in British Church history.

This is the event with which the Archbishop has to deal.

His purpose is obviously to take possession, in the name of Anglicanism, of St. German and his mission. His task is to describe St. German's work, and at the same time cut it off as clearly as possible from any association with Rome.

Now it is precisely here that Prosper, as a historical third, becomes unmanageable.

The Archbishop begins by constructing an argument upon the fact that the British bishops applied for help not to Rome but to Gaul.

The Church here sent to the Church in Gaul to send them a competent teacher. Why did they send to Gaul? Because Gaul was their mother Church. They did not send to Rome—though the Bishop of Rome was glad enough to approve of their going—but they sent to their mother Church. It did not occur to them that it was necessary to send to Italy for teachers; they sent home, as it were.

And proceeding from this to draw the desired conclusion, he says :—

It showed us how Rome was never recognised as the sole fountain of doctrine, or as the sole power which could correct error ; for that old Church in this land did not apply to Rome as mother and mistress ; they went to their own mother. And to this we had now to add the consideration that Rome in those days was so much purer than now ; there was no tale to tell everywhere of oppression ; she did not stand then as the great factory of new doctrine.

The answer to this is so obvious that it hardly needs statement. The words just cited mean that the whole position in Britain has been misapprehended.

There was no *controversia fidei* amongst the British bishops.

They were Catholics, and had no doubt whatever as to what was the orthodox and Catholic teaching. They had no need of any decision as to what was the Catholic faith. But they *had* need of missionaries to help them to preach it, and thus to refute the Pelagian heretics. And, being in possession of their senses, they applied for such help to the nearest Catholic country.

When a house is on fire, people seek water from the nearest hydrant.

Apparently the Archbishop would have expected them to boycott the Catholic preachers in Gaul, and diligently to pass right through almost the entire length of that country ; to cross the Alps, and to make a journey of some thousand miles and of some months' duration, all for some unintelligible purpose of having no other helpers or preachers except priests taken from the Papal City !

Heresy is not wanting in Britain of to-day, and when our bishops are pressed to meet the needs of our missions, they seek aid by obtaining devoted missionaries, who, with the sanction of their ecclesiastical authorities, come over and help us from Ireland, France, Belgium, Holland and Germany.

We wonder if some future Archbishop of Canterbury, holding in his hand our clergy-lists of to-day, will draw from it an argument that the Archbishop of Westminster and his

suffragans could not have regarded Rome as their Mother Church—else they would have gone there, and not elsewhere, for any missionary help they needed!

But the Archbishop has to confront a much more serious difficulty.

The mission of St. German is related by Bede, who, no doubt, followed the account of it which was given by Constantius, who wrote the life of St. German. In this St. German is simply said to have been sent to Britain by the Bishops of Gaul. Now Constantius wrote his life about 470, *viz.*, about some fifty years after the events which he is describing. We naturally look for some earlier testimony, and by the laws of historical evidence, we are bound to prefer contemporary to post-temporary evidence.

We call for a witness, and we are answered at once by Prosper of Aquitaine.

Who is he?

Prosper was born in Aquitaine (less than a hundred miles from Auxerre) about the year 403. He was fifteen years old when St. German was made Bishop of Auxerre. He became a monk, and about A.D. 430 went to Rome on a mission to Pope Celestine, and subsequently became secretary to Pope Leo I.

Prosper was with Pope Celestine in 431, only two years after German's mission to Britain. He thus speaks to us as a contemporary witness at headquarters, and one who, by virtue of his position and office, commanded the most accurate and authentic sources of information.

What does Prosper say?

He tells us it was the Pope who sent German into Britain and sent him as his own "vicar" (*vice sua*). It is in these words that Prosper records this fact in his Chronicle:—

"At the instance of the deacon Palladius, Pope Celestine sent German, Bishop of Auxerre, as his vicar (*vice sua*), and led back the British people to the Catholic faith, having driven out the heretics" (Opp. i., 401).

Nor is this a mere incidental reference. In another part of his Chronicle, speaking of the conversion of Ireland he

says that the Pope "appointed a Bishop for the Irish (*Scotis*), and thus made the barbarous island Christian, while he preserved the Roman island (Britain) Catholic" (Opp. i., 197).

Thus it is that as soon as the Archbishop begins to speak of St. German, Prosper cries out and cannot be silenced.

The Archbishop asks his hearers to note that there was no recourse to Rome. Prosper intervenes and assures us the very reason why St. German came was that Pope Celestine sent him thither, and sent him as his own vicar!

Nor can the Archbishop attempt to ignore a witness of this kind. Prosper can very well say: "You are trying to make out that St. German's mission had nothing to do with Rome. I, on the contrary, absolutely maintain that it was a Roman mission, or what you would call an 'Italian Mission'; and that St. German came into Britain as the Vicar of the Pope. Now in speaking of this mission, how can you in the nineteenth century really pretend to know better than I who lived at and wrote at the time?—better than I who stood at the side of the very Pope who sent him, and who as Papal Secretary had the documents of the time under my hands?"

And Anglican authorities of the highest order practically acknowledge the force of this plea.

When dealing with the question of the date of the mission, Haddan and Stubbs (*Eccles. Councils*, vol. i., 17) admit that Prosper as living in Rome in 431, and a professed chronicler, is the best evidence. They think that he may have had a tendency to exaggerate the Pope's "spiritual authority". (Apparently the Gallican Church produced Ultramontanes in the fifth century!) But they do not call in question the fact of the Papal mission, and hold that Prosper described what took place in Rome, just as Constantius described what took place in Gaul, and that both are equally reliable for their own side of the subject.

Then we are led to ask how, with this well-known historical testimony of Prosper before him, did the Archbishop attempt to meet it, or explain it away, when preaching to the people of St. German's?

No one will believe that the Archbishop was ignorant of

Prosper's testimony, and no one cares to believe that he lacks the courage of facing the whole of the facts when he professedly deals with a given historical subject, or that he is capable of evading what his fellow-bishop, Dr. Stubbs, and every ordinarily well-informed student knows to be an integral and important part of the historical evidence.

The reporters may have mutilated his sermon, and thus have placed him in a false position. But if the reports in *The Guardian* and *The Church Times* be correct, then the Archbishop's action is inexplicable. It would mean this. He found on the subject he was treating a historical testimony which destroyed the main contention of his sermon. In fact, Prosper stood in his path and gave to it an unqualified contradiction.

What does the Archbishop do with this hostile evidence?

He does not refute it. He does not examine it. He does not even allude to it. He simply says nothing about it. He leaves his hearers under the impression that he has told them all that is to be told—until they find it out! *Ce n'est pas magnifique, et ce n'est pas la guerre!*

It is truly good and right and fitting that the great lessons of Church history should be—even from the pulpit—taught to the people. Every service which Anglicans or others by speech or research may render to the cause of historical truth should be welcomed as a definite gain for all. But they or we may well pray to be preserved from preachers who venture to treat historical issues by distorting one-half of the truth and suppressing the other.

CHAPTER LXI.

The Characteristics of the God-Made Church and of the Man-Made Church.

(1ST OCTOBER, 1898.)

THERE can be no doubt that the controversies as to the Real Presence, the Sacrifice of the Mass, and the Confessional, which are chronic sources of crisis in the Anglican Church, are, and must be, questions of grave and solemn import to the

conscience of the questioners. But there is one which underlies them all, and which transcends in logical importance any demand which may be made to the Anglican Church, or any answer which she may find to give to it. This root-question is what we may call the "Church-question," and turns upon the capacity of the Anglican Church to teach as a Church at all, and it is upon this, the most fundamental of issues, that a lurid light has been shed by the facts of the present time.

To Catholics, who already possess in their faith the solution of such difficulties, the answer will appear little more than a truism. They will say, or feel, if they say it not, when they gaze on the spectacle we have just described, that the Anglican Church is only revealing herself in her native and constitutional character. If she were indeed the Catholic Mother, how different it all would be. She would know how to put her house in order, and to "speak with authority". She would give a plain decisive answer which would bring peace and light to the minds of her distracted children. Her word would be at once that of a Mother who soothes and a Mistress who decides. When she had spoken what seemed good to her and to the Holy Ghost, the multitude would "hold their peace"; nor would she suffer her teaching—because it is her Lord's teaching—to be gainsaid within her household. She would make peace within her borders. Her voice would be just as clear-ringing to-day as when it stilled the controversial tempests at Nicæa, at Constantinople, at Ephesus or Chalcedon; as full of blessing to the sons of obedience, but as sharp and firm even to anathema for the children of contradiction. This is the vision of the great Catholic Mother who, holding safely at her breast the revealed Word of God, has trod so majestically the path of the centuries from Pentecost to the present time. *Et vera incessu patuit Dea*. Her children look into her eyes and love her, and their obedience to her word is a joy as deep as the peace which the world cannot give. It is against this vision of authority and unity that the figure of the Anglican Church, with its helpless, halting hesitancy, its faltering speech, its pitiful recourse to human ambiguities and its divided and distracted household, stands out before

us in a contrast which speaks to the consciences of men far more eloquently than words. The *rationale* of the contrast lies embedded in principles which bring us near to the foundations of all religious controversies.

There is no mid-term between the Creator and that which is created. In like manner, when we come to that most interesting and most decisive turning-point in the path of religious inquiry, the formation of our notion of what is meant by the "*Church*," we are likely to find that in the last analysis there are but two possible concepts which can be brought under the term. Christ as the Divine Teacher can come here upon earth, and form a society or "kingdom" of men to whom He can commit a Divine message, with His authority to teach it, expound it, and defend it, and His Holy Spirit to preserve it from corruption. These men, thus commissioned, can go forth and disciple men in all nations, teaching them with authority what they have to believe, and the meaning in which they have to believe it, and preserving throughout the purity and integrity of their message by eliminating from the fellowship of believers those who would gainsay or pervert their teaching. In other words, we have the familiar concept of an Infallible Teaching Church, fulfilling her mission by means of the Authoritative Magisterium and the *Sacramentum Unitatis*. How such a Church will speak, act, judge, decide, and how, if need be, she will anathematise both the heresy and the heretic, need not be described. It is written large over the face of Church history.

Another concept of a church is one which is essentially distinct. A number of men may combine to form for themselves a church, or take possession of an existing church for their own purpose, assigning the standards of belief and worship. They may preserve the Scriptures and the Creeds, but interpreting them according to their own judgment. For the purposes of public worship and teaching, formularies may be agreed upon, inside of the lines of which the officers of the church shall preach and minister. We have here a sample of a Church *self-constituted*. It is the creation of its

members. These members are its constituency. It has, of course, a public authority, as all constituted societies must have, but the voice of that public authority is nothing more than the collectivity of the voices of the private judgment of its members. We know that Parliament governs this nation, but only because Parliament is itself the creature and servant of the nation, of whose will and pleasure it is duly informed. There is a supremacy behind its supremacy. The mandate comes up, although the law and the judgment go down, and as a matter of fact constituted authority never really talks back to its constituency.

If a Church is *self-constituted*, it is inevitably held fast by the same natural laws, and bound by the same ontological conditions. It is a *Resultant*, and to the end of time it will be simply what its members make it. It will reflect their energy, their piety, their philanthropy, their zeal, but as to the Church's mind and magisterium, its teaching on doctrine and worship—it will never do more than echo back to them some collective expression of the cries which have already emanated from their own individual judgments. And from this original dependence, from which, by the law of its being, it can never escape, certain consequences will follow, and make themselves palpably manifest on the face of its life and working. Because the constituent private judgments are many and various, they will naturally, by a law of affinity and sympathy, fall into main groups which become "parties" or "schools of thought". Because such groups by the law of their life tend to intensify and to diverge, dogmatic unity becomes more and more an impossibility, and as each, by virtue of its constituent character, has a right to hold to its place (a constituted authority rarely expels any notable section of its constituency), the general Church is forced into having contradictory doctrines preached at the same time within its household, and to console itself with the thought that it is "comprehensive". Ah yes! Comprehensive!—comprehensive of men, not of Catholic truth.

As the development and divergence of the "parties" or private judgment groups proceed, the common bonds of the original standards of belief which had hitherto held the

general body together are sure to become strained, until nothing but forced unnatural interpretations will save them from snapping. As the constituent elements of private judgment change from century to century, the set of formularies which fitted at one period becomes unfitting in another; and when it is retained in defiance of the natural law of adaptation of speech to mind, recourse has to be had to demoralising methods of reading into such formularies meanings which they were never meant to contain, and of reading out of them the very meanings which they were called into existence to express.

But above all, when the disruption from within reaches the stage of crisis, and when the intestine controversies have been carried to the point when an appeal must be made to some public authority, then more patently than ever the helplessness and the purely human weakness of the self-constituted Church reveals itself. How shall the echo sit on judgment on the voice that produced it? What can the authorities of such a Church do but reproduce some general expression—some “greatest common measure”—of the various currents of wills, judgments, opinions, views and sympathies which are surging beneath them. Themselves the creation of such elements, how can they condemn, much less exclude, any notable section of them? Section A must not be expelled because it teaches heresy, but Section A’s teaching shall not be considered heresy, because Section A cannot be expelled. “Room for all schools of thought must be found within the National Church.” Hence the Anglican can never get out of his Church in the form of a public decision anything but the reflex of what he and his fellow-Anglicans, past or present, in their respective private judgments, have already contributed to her. His own decision will be sent back to him in the shape of a general resultant or balance struck with the decision of his neighbours.

Here we have the inevitable origin of another system of expedients—hardly less pitiable or demoralising—namely, the use of advisedly ambiguous formularies and of delphic judgments. We do not speak of the tissues of nebulous

platitudes and pietistic phrases in certain public utterances meant to veil or evade dogmatic issues—a species of childish and nauseous legerdemain which is beneath contempt. We refer to official or judicial pronouncements in which the authorities of a self-constituted Church are called upon to give a decision upon grave questions of doctrine and worship. How can such authorities decide, except by summing up into a general finding, or compromise, what the constituent masses of public religious opinion have already decided for themselves? What can they do but endeavour as honestly as they can to strike a fair average of the views of the litigant parties and the schools of thought behind them? Hence the terror of definition, the unwillingness, the hesitancy to decide at all, and finally, when decision is inevitable, that halting, faltering voice, elaborating a judgment into the very warp and woof of which is interwoven yes and no, put forth with a pathetic anxiety to “be satisfactory to all parties,” and, above all, with carefulness never to lose sight of its never-to-be-forgotten exigency, that no school of thought—*i.e.*, party with a sufficiently large following—shall be “denied standing room within the National Church”.

In a word, all such judgments are determined from below by the existing conditions of thought and will amongst the people to be judged, and all such judgments are nothing more than the reflex and the equation of the *ego sapio* which the religious public has received from its constituent individuals. And because it is so, the microcosm of the judgment has represented in it the discordant elements of the macrocosm of the constituent opinion, and by the very necessity of its composition it clothes itself in terms which mean, and are meant to mean, compromise and ambiguity.

Thus the essential marks of a self-constituted as distinguished from a divinely constituted Church may be said to be especially three. First, *Doctrinal dependence upon its members, viz.*, instead of teaching its people, as an *Ecclēsia docens*, it is in reality taught by them, and instead of moulding its members according to its mind, its mind is, on the contrary, moulded by the views and sympathies of its

members, and is, in fact, nothing more than the reflex and resultant of the collective private judgment of the parties and individuals of which its membership is composed. Secondly, as a result, the *helplessness of the Church to bind its members by authoritative judgments*. Itself the creature of the collection of individual judgments, it cannot reverse the law of power, and turn its authority against its source. Hence its unwillingness to pronounce judgments, and when compelled by the exigencies of order to do so, its care to confine itself to mere reflex judgments, namely, judgments which reflect the average feeling and opinion, or the common or compromise agreement already existing amongst its members. Thirdly, as a result of this, *ambiguity or contradictory interpretation of formularies and of judgment*. For, where the constituency is itself divided and holding contradictory beliefs—(and it cannot be otherwise when private judgment is the constituent element)—no honestly worded, or at least honestly interpreted, formulary could cover both, and hence the contradiction of parties reproduces itself inevitably in either the wording or the interpretation of the formularies.

.

These we take it are the conspicuous marks of the man-made Church marked off against the God-made Church which is founded upon the Rock.

Gladly we welcome the teeming evidences of the growing zest of inquiry in the quest of religious truth, which on all sides has been brought to light by the events through which we are passing; and gladly we recognise the zeal, the earnestness, the sincerity of numberless souls in the Anglican Communion who so generously are struggling to follow the leading of the light which is given them. Who amongst us can look unmoved at the approach of these brethren from afar, or without echoing from our hearts the cry of the Church: *Salvos fac servos tuos, Deus meus, sperantes in Te?*

But if we are asked, What is the main lesson which the present crisis in the Anglican Church seems to us to convey with such clearness and emphasis in the face of the nation?—we feel that it is to be found in the luminous revelation of all these marks by which Anglicanism writes its own genesis as a mere human and self-constituted Church, so

widely different, and so far removed from, and so opposed to the divinely constituted Church of Christ, even as the feeble and changing work of man is and must be to the strong and imperishable work of God.

CHAPTER LXII.

Characteristics of the Anglican Crisis.

(14TH JANUARY, 1899.)

THE present Anglican crisis undoubtedly has arisen upon questions which, to the contending parties concerned, are in a high degree vexed and controversial. From the dialectics of the controversy the masses and the millions, as we might expect, will gladly stand aloof. But the crisis itself, quite apart from any weighing of the *pro* and *con*, and considered simply as a public fact, presents certain features which are so plain and so public that they can hardly be called in question. These features suggest a few considerations which may be the more interesting as they lie above and beyond the actual controversy, and nearer to those first principles to which in the long run all religious controversies travel back, and in which sooner or later they must find their final solution.

To begin with, the most salient feature of the crisis is that it is Ritualistic—that is to say, that it turns upon matters of liturgy or ritual. The point of dispute is—shall certain ceremonies be used or prohibited? shall certain prayers be said or omitted? From the beginning to the end, the Church of England seems oppressed by the weight of some inner exigency of which she is deeply but silently conscious, and by which she feels that all her controversies, whatever they may be, must at any cost be worded in terms of ritual, and must be fought out solely within the sphere of public worship.

Now it is passing strange that it should be so. Thoughtful souls will ask themselves the reason why. Every one in England and out of it is perfectly well aware that the root of these Anglican disputes is essentially dogmatic. The real question is not whether incense shall be burned, the host

elevated, or certain prayers omitted—but shall the doctrines which these things symbolise and express be *believed* or *rejected*? As Mr. Green Armytage has well pointed out, the ritual action or prayer is but the flag of a given Eucharistic doctrine hoisted in the sanctuary, and quite as much as at Fashoda, its being kept up or hauled down is really a matter of whether the doctrine is to be believed or to be denied by those who stand behind it. And if this, the question of belief, is the real question, surely it is matter of elementary doctrinal honesty that it should be dealt with as such. Is there not a certain hollowness, a certain lack of doctrinal straightforwardness, a certain departure from the manliness of Christian candour in this persistent shutting up of the dispute within the domain of worship, and this eager peddling with details of ritual, when all Anglicans know and feel—no one better than their bishops—that the dogmatic issue on which all depends remains behind, shelved, evaded, and nervously kept in the background, and by tacit consent left untouched by authoritative decision.

.

The dogmatic issue is the vital one, but there is no decisive authority in Anglicanism which dares to deal with it. The whole action of the Anglican bishops in the matter amounts to a pitiful confession. Put into words, it means: We cannot tell you what to *believe*. We cannot tell you whether Christ is present in the Sacrament before reception, or merely after you receive it.¹ When it lies on the table

¹ The Archbishop of Canterbury in his Primary Visitation Charge at Canterbury (10th Oct., 1898) publicly stated the position of the Anglican Church as follows: "And this is the dispute which is commonly called the dispute concerning the Real Presence. The Church of England has given no answer to this question, and Hooker, undeniably a very high authority on Church of England doctrines, maintains that the Real Presence should not be looked for in the consecrated elements but in the receivers. They certainly receive a real gift, and, knowing this, why should we ask any further question? Knowing the reality of the gift we get, we know all that is needed for our spiritual life. The Church certainly teaches Hooker's doctrine, but to this it must be added that the Church nowhere forbids the further doctrine that there is a Real Presence attached in some way to the elements at the time of consecration." This latter doctrine, which the Church does not teach, but does not forbid, the Archbishop affirms to be undistinguishable from the Lutheran doctrine of consubstantiation.

after consecration we cannot tell you whether you ought to adore it or not. It may be impiety if you don't, and it may be idolatry if you do—we cannot decide for you. We cannot tell you whether the service itself is the Sacrifice of the Mass or not. Perhaps it is only a sacrifice of thanksgiving and mere commemoration of a sacrifice which is past and over forever—but some say that is deadly heresy. Perhaps it is a Propitiatory Sacrifice in which Christ really offers His Body and Blood which He offered on Calvary—but others say that is a blasphemous fable and dangerous deceit. We cannot decide. All that we can do is to regulate the outward action and speech of your clergyman in celebrating the service. We shall see that he limits himself to the Book of Common Prayer, and that he does not use extreme ritual accessories which would be interpreted as settling one side or other of the questions which we leave undecided.

Here then we have the first and the most palpable and predominant feature of the present crisis—the *dogmatic helplessness* of the Anglican Church to decide the sense and meaning of her own Sacraments. Observe that it cannot be pleaded that this is a matter which is not fundamental, for it touches vitally and decisively the very meaning of the Communion and the chief and central act of Christian worship. Also the question is a trenchant one. An Anglican sees on the Lord's Table the consecrated Sacrament which later on he is to receive. It is practically necessary for him to know if Christ is present there or not—for if present, he certainly ought to adore Him there; if not, he as certainly ought not. It is then a plain question of *is* or *is not*. It is either one or the other, and there is no thinkable mid-term between them—consequently it is not in the least a case in which the usual euphemism about “two sides of the same truth,” etc., can have any application.

Out of this feature of dogmatic helplessness arises a question, and one which cannot but press crucially upon the conscience of earnest and truth-seeking Anglicans. *Why* should it be so? *Why* should it be that Anglicanism has no doctrinal judgment-seat and possesses no authority capable of deciding such issues for its perplexed and dis-

tracted members? Is the Anglican Communion an integral part of the Catholic Church? But the primary business of the Catholic Church is to *teach*—and the very least that may be expected of a teaching Church is that it will teach the meaning of its own Sacraments and the sense of its own formularies. If it cannot do that, it can hardly have a claim to teach at all.

And this incongruity becomes the more glaring if we bear in mind that Anglicanism in rejecting certain Catholic doctrines as “mediæval accretions,” claims to take its stand upon the principles of Christian antiquity. For it would be hard to imagine anything more utterly unlike Christian antiquity than this dogmatic helplessness, and this evasion of a dogmatic decision and this attempt to cover it by a pitiful recourse to mere regulation of ritual. Anglicans who are familiar with the history of the Church in the first five centuries, and with the treatment of the various religious controversies which arose in that period, will know exactly what we mean.

Let us suppose that points of disputed belief analogous to those which now convulse the Anglican Communion had arisen, say in Italy, Africa, Gaul, Asia Minor or Greece, during the fifth century, what would have happened? The bishop of the diocese, as Judge of Faith, would have given a decision, defining for his flock what they had to believe, and what they had to reject as false doctrine and poisonous pasture. Or, if the matter transcended his competence or affected a wider area than his diocese, it might have been referred to the provincial synod and the sentence of the Metropolitan. Or, if of still graver import, as a *causa major*, it might travel to the Apostolic See, or be made the chief business of an Œcumenical Council. But in all cases, the *method and scope* of decision would be clearly and unmistakably the same. Whether the decision was given by the Bishop, the Metropolitan, the Holy See, or the General Council, it would be *doctrinal*. It would have gone straight to the root question of *belief*, and would have settled it by an authoritative decision. Catholics would be told what they had to believe, and what they must reject. And the decision

would be "spoken with authority". All who refused to accept it would be promptly made to pass through the Church's door, and as preachers of another gospel struck with an anathema. The mere idea of these ancient bishops shirking the question of belief and betaking themselves to regulations of ritual—prayers, incense, holy water!—would be ludicrously contrary to the whole habits of thought, action and conciliar process of the Church in the primitive period.

To Catholics the explanation of this incongruity, as we have seen in the previous chapter, is not far to seek. The Anglican establishment is a human institution based upon the national compromise made at the Reformation. Its primary and absolute condition is that it shall function as the Church of the bulk of the English nation. As a result, if in the course of time any section of the English people, in the exercise of their free individual or collective judgments, shall adopt various or hostile meanings of the accepted doctrines or formularies, it has a constitutional right to do so. (Why not as much as the people of the sixteenth century?) And the Anglican Church, by the law of its own origin, must continue to give it standing room. The end of its being is to "comprehend" them. Hence, it must, as a general rule, carefully avoid an authoritative definition of one meaning rather than another, and most of all the pronouncement of any decision which would exclude or displace any notable section of its constituency. In fact definition can only be attempted when an overwhelming majority can be counted upon in its favour, and when the excluded are a *quantité négligeable*. Its primary fixed term is *men*. That is very much what we might expect in a church made by men. The Catholic Church works in a way just the reverse of this, and begins at the other end. Her primary and absolute and fixed term is Catholic *truth*—the preservation of a certain body of revealed truth, and in the true sense and meaning in which Christ taught it. Her constituency, world-wide as it is, is at all times rigidly adapted to it. She will acknowledge none for her members who do not receive the truth which she teaches and in the Christ-meaning in which she teaches it. If any of her members

put varying senses upon her doctrines she is prompt, by the very instinct and law of her life, to sift and separate the true sense from the false one, to define with authority what must be held and what must be rejected, and she will fearlessly enforce her decision by anathema, even if whole nations should go their way "and walk no longer with" her. In other words, she is comprehensive of the Deposit of Divine truth, and she knows well that this, the only true form of comprehensiveness, depends upon the elimination of every erroneous meaning, and of those who hold it. It is thus that the Catholic Church by her constitution is just as ready to define and to decide as the Anglican Church is to avoid and evade definition and decision. The contrast is clear to the point of antithesis. In one case we have the acceptance of doctrines in a fixed sense to begin with, and the inclusion of men dependent on it; in the other, we have the inclusion of men the primary necessity, and the sense in which doctrines may be accepted regulated to suit it. In the one case we have the comprehensiveness of truth, in the other the comprehensiveness of people. In the one case definition must ever be watchfully at work so as to secure the purity and integrity of doctrine; in the other definition must be more and more carefully avoided, so as to allow the maximum of standing room to the holders of various and varying doctrines. All this seems to us little more than a present-day paraphrase of the parable of the God-made House on the Rock and the man-made house on the shifting sands; and it seems to us that the events of the time—amid the wind and the floods of the present controversy—are preaching it more loudly and clearly than any weak words of ours could avail to express it.

Besides this dogmatic helplessness, another feature of the present Anglican crisis hardly less prominent is one which is inseparably the outcome of the same causes—namely, *dogmatic complicity*. We are not referring in any way to the question of Religious Toleration in its civil aspects, but to the tolerance and intercommunion within the pale of the same Church of members professing and teaching essentially hostile doctrines. Out of this arises

a consideration which, it seems to us, concerns or ought to concern especially that section of the Church of England which claims for itself the name of Catholic. Just now this section, including a large number of pious, earnest and devoted men, is being fiercely attacked for its defence of such doctrines as the Real Objective Presence, the Sacrifice of the Mass, and the Invocation of the Blessed Virgin and the Saints. They meet the attack by vehemently maintaining that these doctrines are part of their "Catholic inheritance," and have the undisputed sanction of "Catholic consent" of both East and West. Little more than two years ago, when ultimate Corporate Reunion and proximate recognition of Anglican Orders were being pushed at Rome, with a zeal which even over-reached itself, eminent authorities, *in urbe*, were assured that the Ritualists of England were ready to shed their blood for all these beliefs not less than we ourselves. If that is the case, there is a conclusion which they can hardly blame us for drawing from their action. They must regard the doctrines we have mentioned as integral parts of the Catholic faith and, as a rigorous consequence, they must regard the denial and rejection of these truths as treason to faith and as what the Church, with the emphasis of the anger that sins not, declares to be "damnable heresy". But that being so, they ought to hold these truths not academically, but as Christians do, vitally, and with readiness and determination equal to our own, to lay down their lives, if need be, rather than inwardly or outwardly deny them, or be partakers or communicators with those who deny them. Now is this their attitude?

A few weeks ago the Archbishop of Canterbury, the chief Bishop of their Church, delivers in the face of the nation a solemn pronouncement, in which he declares that the Church of England "certainly teaches" the receptionist theory of the Eucharist taught by Hooker, and he grants as an alternative to his flock a doctrine which he himself affirms to be "undistinguishable" from Lutheranism. To all High Churchmen who have been making overtures to East and West this Hooker-or-Luther exposition of Anglican Eucharistic doctrine ought to have been nothing less

than a manifesto of detestable and destructive heresy against the Blessed Sacrament of the altar. In a chief teacher, it could not be other than a treason against the Faith of Christ. In such a case of public and manifest heretical teaching, according to elementary Catholic principles, it becomes a duty of conscience to separate from the Communion of the heretical teacher. Amongst the Ritualists who two years ago were so profuse in their assurances and protestation of Catholic belief at Rome, how many now dream of acting on this practical and logical consequence of their profession? For aught we know, Lord Halifax and his friends, who speak not a little of "Catholic Faith," "Catholic Principles," "Catholic Inheritance," are as ready to-morrow as they have ever been, to receive the Communion from the hands of the Archbishop of Canterbury, who has uttered this profession of heresy, or, for that matter, from the hands of the Anglican Bishop of Liverpool, whose whole life and teaching is one prolonged utterance of this heretical denial. It seems to us that the profession of "Catholicism" on these terms would be a marvellously cheap one, and would have saved a whole world of martyrdom in the days of the Arian persecution.

.

But even if the conscience or courage of Ritualists in the face of such a trial has failed to rise to the level of Catholic principle, and the recognition of the duty of separation, we could have imagined that they would have suggested an attempt to free their souls from complicity by something in the shape of a public protest. Not that any such paper procedure would have covered for a moment the complicity of intercommunion, but it would have represented the minimum to be expected of those whose eager protestations of Catholic Eucharistic belief are still fresh in the ears of the Roman authorities. Even for this we look in vain. The section of the Anglican press which is held to represent the High Church and Ritualist party is in fact more ready to praise than to protest against the heretical declaration of the Archbishop. *The Guardian* could only extol it as the most remarkable utterance that had come "from an Archbishop of Canterbury for the last two hundred years". *The Church*

Times, with some feeble words of criticism, "received it with profound gratitude"!

In the face of these public facts of complaisant compliance, it is difficult to shut our minds to the reflection that if this be the fibre of the Ritualist section of the Church of England, they have still much to learn before they have realised even the elements of Catholic Faith or the means of keeping it even if they had.

We are not of the number of those who would extinguish the smoking flax, nor yet of those who are unreasonable enough to expect the clearness of Catholic vision in souls who as yet can only see men "as trees walking". But Catholic Faith, which is at least the avowed ideal and the goal of the Ritualist, is not a mere verbal profession or a cultus of dilettanti. It does not consist in affecting the dress and externals of Catholic worship, still less in abundant use of the word Catholic, or in spelling Catholicity with a large C. And certainly it does not consist in the pitiable claim expressed by *The Guardian*, of "liberty to teach the Catholic faith"—(as if Catholicity in a church did not, by the very law of its being, mean the exclusion from its pale of all heretical teaching!).¹ It involves responsibilities and sacrifices, and if these are not faced the position becomes very much that of the man who becomes a soldier for the sake of a pretty uniform, but who leaves to others the dangers and hardships which belong to those who would wear it worthily. It is this failure to grasp the sterling responsibilities entailed by belief in Catholic doctrine, and this fatal complicity by communion in what must be felt to be heretical teaching that seems to us one of the plainest and one of the least encouraging characteristics of the Anglican crisis, so far as it has been unrolled before us.

¹ Nothing is more utterly false to the very concept of the Catholic Church, and of primitive practice, than the theory that a Church can be Catholic while permitting heresy to be taught and believed in her name by official teachers within her pale, or that a Church can be Catholic which openly allows her ministers to teach a heretical doctrine, as long as the belief of the orthodox doctrine is likewise permitted. Such a recognised lodgment of heresy within her pale and teaching ministry is fatal to the claim of being Catholic.

And here, again, the action and attitude of Anglicans on both sides stand out in sharp contrast to the canons of Christian antiquity. On the pages of early history of the Church, no principle is written so clearly, or enforced so continually in its ordinary working, as that of the *sacramentum unitatis*, the preserving of orthodoxy by intercommunion of the faithful and the elimination of heresy by excommunication. The chief work and care of the Church was to preserve intact the Deposit of Faith. If any bishop taught doctrine which was manifestly heretical, the other bishops closed in against him, and shut him out of the circle of Catholic communion. The ordinary mass of the laity and the simple faithful might not be able to enter into the merits of the controversy, or into the subtleties of the heretical teacher—there was no reason why they should—but there was that which they could see for themselves without possibility of mistake. They could see whether the bishops and clergy communicated with him or not. That was a plain and public fact, and it was to them and to the Church at large the indubitable Catholic test of Catholic orthodoxy which told them whether his teaching was to be received or avoided. Hence in Catholic antiquity, as now, to communicate in a heretical Eucharist is to communicate in heretical teaching. Without this standard and this law of purity of communion, the Deposit of Faith could never have been preserved in its passage down the ages.

If High Church Anglicans believe, as they assure us they do believe, that the doctrines of the Real Objective Presence, the Sacrifice of the Mass, and the Invocation of the Saints are indeed integral parts of Catholic faith, and the denial of them heresy, they must judge for themselves how far the sacred rule of Catholic antiquity as to communion with heretical teachers is trodden under foot by them, and how far their whole position in England at the present moment is in absolute contradiction to it. Undoubtedly their situation is one beset with difficulties which command our sympathy. But Catholic Truth rests upon principles, and where those principles claim our action, who shall plead against them? Who would not dread the responsibility of standing before the judgment-seat of Christ in the guilt of complicity with

those who have mutilated His message and contradicted His teaching? If merely to say God-speed be a partakership with such evil deeds, what shall we say of the fellowship of kneeling at their side to receive holy communion?

If the Anglican crisis in its present and future development serves to make this duty of spiritual self-preservation more clear, and to press it home to the conscience of many of our sincere and truth-loving Anglican fellow-countrymen, the controversies of the moment will not have been in vain, and God's Providence disposing all things sweetly, and from end to end reaching mightily, will have wrested one more blessed victory for Truth out of the ways and works of human wilfulness.

INDEX.

- ADAMNAN, his account of St. Columba, 137.
Adaptation of men to doctrine, or of doctrine to men, 485.
Alcuin's letter to Pope Leo III., 95.
Aldred, 90.
Alexander, Archbishop, on the Ancient Celtic and English Church, 135.
Alford, Bishop, on the Lambeth Judgment, 324.
Alien? who is the, 241.
Allen, Cardinal, on prohibition to go to Anglican Churches, 221.
Altar against altar, 27.
American Anglicanism, 123.
Ancient Church of England, with whom is it? 61.
Anglican opinion on the Lambeth Judgment, 321.
Anglican theory of Church constitution, 361.
Anglicanism and the appeal to Scripture, 343.
Anglo-Saxon Church and Catholic belief, Confession, the Mass, Invocation of Saints, and Purgatory, 75.
"Antichrist" in English Church history, 295.
Apostolic See, appeal to, in Ancient Irish Church, 141.
Apostolic succession and the Anglican Archbishop of Dublin, 435-36.
Appeal *against*, the, 352.
Appeal to Scripture and the Church Congress, 429; Catholic appeal, 343, 348.
Appeals, the three, and Bishop Gore, 354.
Appropriation, why not appropriate the Pope? 233.
Archbishopric, the making and unmaking of, by Papal authority, 70.
Arundel (Archbishop) and the Lollards, 44.
Assemani, J. S. and J. A., on Nestorianism, 447.
Athos, the monks at, 192.
Authority in belief, 475.
- BADGER, Rev. G. P., on Nestorianism, 446.
Baptism of Duchess of Sparta, 205.
Barons of England in 1245, letter to Pope, 31.
Barons of England and Martin V., 341.
Benson, Archbishop, and double-dealing in worship, 49; on the "Italian Mission," 56; and Nestorian belief, 454-57.
Bickersteth, Bishop, on the Catholic Church, 296.
Bidding of the Bedes, 67.
Birinus, St., Apostle of Wessex, 376.
Bishops of England and Martin V., 339.

- Bishops' position in Catholic Church, 367; early manner of appointment, 370.
- Black, Rev. W., his stand against remarriage of the divorced, 285.
- Blackwood, Sir Arthur, on Catholicism, 248.
- Boniface, St., or Winfrid, 378; his oath of obedience to the Pope, 379.
- Bristol, the mitre at, 281.
- British Church, the, 256; and Pope Celestine, 472.
- Brooks, Dr. Phillips, 236.
- Bulls from Pope procured for Winchester School, 418.
- CANDLE-BURNING in Ancient English Church, 424; its meaning, 426; in the East, 427.
- Candlemas blessing in St. Ethelwold's Benedictional, 381.
- Capitular elections in Anglicanism, 115.
- Capitular independence in Catholic days, 116.
- Carlisle, Bishop of, on Royal Supremacy, 98.
- Catholic and Anglican, a test, 89.
- Catholic Church, a complete society, 100.
- Celibacy, clerical, 86, 118, 184; and St. Ethelwold, 382.
- Chalcedon, Council of, on Primacy, 60.
- Chalcuyth, Council of, on the Six General Councils, 13.
- Characteristics of the Anglican crisis, 481.
- Characteristics of the God-made Church and the man-made Church, 474.
- Charles Borromeo, St., 153.
- Chicheley, Archbishop, and Martin V., 326; his manner of addressing the Pope, 96.
- Christianity, Eastern, 192.
- Church Congress at Hull in 1890, 17.
- Church Congress and the appeal to Scripture, 429.
- Church Times* and Irish Anglican bishops, 277.
- Churching, 210.
- Clergy Discipline Bill, 172.
- Coat, holy, 225.
- Columba, St., his life at Iona, 137.
- Commons of England in 1245, letter to Pope, 32.
- Complicity, dogmatic, 486.
- Comprehensiveness, 485.
- Confession in Ancient Irish Church, 140, 160; repudiated by Anglican Synod, 161.
- Confessional, the, in Anglican Churches in America, 163.
- Congress, Anglican Church, Rhyl, 241.
- Constitution of the Catholic Church and Royal Supremacy, 93.
- Continuity, old and new, 31.
- Continuity, the nature of Catholic, 80.
- Continuity, Anglican, a popular statement of, 79.
- Continuity, Anglican, as shown in the Diocese of York, 88.
- Continuity at Peterborough, 307.
- Continuity at Winchester, Anglican points of, alleged, 421.
- Criteria, Bishop Gore's, 353.
- DEAD, prayers for, in Nestorian Liturgy, 451.
- Dedication of Winchester Cathedral in 1093, 387.

- Dedication service at Peterborough, 381.
 Definition, doctrinal, 351.
 Development of doctrine, 13, 85, 197; in Eastern Church, 199.
 Development, doctrinal, the term and the principle at the Council of Florence, 349.
 Dissensions in Anglicanism stated by an Anglican bishop, 324.
 Dissenting ministers, proposed admission to Anglican ministry without reordination, 22.
 Divisions and eccentricities, 45.
 Divorce, Anglicanism and, 284.
 Dix, Dr. Morgan, on authority, 133.
 Doctrinal dependence on constituency, 479.
 Dogmatic complicity, 486.
 Dogmatic helplessness, 483.
 Double dealing in worship, 49.
 Dublin, Anglican Archbishop of, on non-necessity of reordaining dissenting ministers, 22.
- EASTERNS, the, and Anglicanism, 182.
 Ecclesiastical power, its origin and direction, 167.
Economia in the Eastern Church, 205.
 Edington, Bishop, his appointment, 395.
 Edward II. and the Apostolic See, 372.
 Edward the Confessor and Westminster Abbey, 74.
 Egbert, Pontifical of, on rite of reconciliation, 26.
 Eirenicon, the Lambeth Judgment as, 317.
 Election, Anglican Episcopal, 107.
 Encyclical, Papal, what is *ex Cathedrâ*? 178.
 English Church History at a Church Congress, 255.
 Enthronement, an Anglican, 135.
 Erastianism and Anglicanism, 171.
 Ethelwold, St., 380.
 Eucharist, testimony of Ancient Irish Church, 160.
 Eucharistic belief and Archbishop Temple, 482 *n.*
 Exeter, its Catholic past, 297.
- FACTS, ten, of Ancient Church of England, 62.
 Farrar (Archdeacon) on vows, 18.
 Florence, the Council of. and doctrinal development, 349.
 Foundation of English Church, 62.
 Frederick, St., 153.
 Free inquiry into Scripture, Bishop Gore, 433.
 Friction between Rome and England in Pre-Reformation times, 329.
 Fulcrum outside the realm, need of, 177.
- GAINSBOROUGH, William, Bishop of Worcester, early instance of renunciation clause, 111.
 Gelasius, Pope, on the Two Powers, spiritual and temporal, 106.
 General Synod in Ireland, its constitution, 165-69.
 German of Auxerre, St., Archbishop Benson on, 469.
 Gloucester, Duke of, and Martin V., 336.
 Gore, Bishop, and appeal to Scripture, 343, 429; critique of his position on, 433 *et seq.*

- Grandisson, Bishop, his profession to the Apostolic See, 113.
 Gregory the Great on the Apostolic See, 60 *n*.
 Guinness, Dr. Grattan, on Catholicism, 250.
- HARVEY, Lord A. C., on the Protestant movement in Italy, 29.
 Hemenhale, Thomas, Bishop of Worcester, the renunciation clause, 112.
 Henry III. and the Winchester monks, 391.
 Henry VI. and the Pope on provisions, 332.
 Homilies on Purgatory, 263.
- IMAGES in Winchester School Chapel, 400.
 Immaculate Conception, the definition of, 9; the doctrine of the, 10.
 Individualism in religion, advocated as true Protestantism, 128.
 Infallibility, Papal, indication of belief in the Pre-Reformation Church, 71 *n*.
 Innocent party, remarriage of, 288.
 Invitation to go to Anglican Churches, 206.
 Ireland, Anglicanism in, plea for continuity, 156; its unity, 162; Cabrera ordination, 276.
 Irish Anglican Prayer-book, 272.
 "Italian Mission," are we an, 59.
- JERUSALEM Bishopric, *Church Times* upon, 46.
 Jurisdiction and the Pope, 366.
- KEMBLE on the authority of the Pallium, 63.
 Kenulph (King), letter to Pope Leo III. and profession of obedience, 72.
- LAMBETH Judgment and Anglican obedience, 1; eve of, 3; the lesson of, 37; reception of, 33; its evasion of question of belief, 37; and the Privy Council, 310; its import, 312; as an Eirenicon, 317.
 Lantern lecture, a, on Winchester, 384.
 Lay control of Anglican Synods in Canada, 16.
 Lay representation in Irish Synods, 163.
 Legatine Councils in Anglo-Saxon times, 68.
 Leo III. and Archbishop Ethelheard, 72.
 Leo IX. and Exeter, 297.
 Leo XIII. on ordinary power of bishops, 370.
 Leofric, Bishop of Exeter, and the Pope, 297.
 Liberty and discipleship, 355.
 Lichfield, the Archbishopric of, 70.
 Lichfield, Bishop of, on penitential works, 120.
 Lightfoot, Bishop, on the Christian ministry, 436.
 Lincoln, Bishop of, on Royal Supremacy, 99-102.
 Littledale, Dr., his monument, 149.
 Liturgy of Ancient English Church, its Roman origin and character, 66.
 Llewellyn and the Pope, 244.
 London, Bishop of, on continuity, 31.
 Low Church opinion, 247; Anglicanism, what it thinks of us, 292.

- MACQUEARY case, 123-34.
- Magee, Archbishop, on continuity, 88; his election, 108; his enthronement, 135; on Clergy Discipline Bill and power of the Crown, 174; on Purgatory, 139.
- "Magna Charta of tyranny," 117.
- Marriage, Catholic doctrine of, 287.
- Mary, the Blessed Virgin, invocation of, in Nestorian Liturgy, 454.
- Mass abolished at Reformation, 21.
- Mass, doctrine of the, in Nestorian Liturgy, 449.
- Mass, reference by Adamnan, 138.
- Masses in Winchester School Chapel, 407.
- Messia, Alfonso, and the devotion of three hours, 145.
- Missions of Anglicanism to the Easterns, 182.
- Mitre at Bristol, the, 281.
- Monastic life at Iona, the three vows, 137.
- Monasticism in the Anglican Church, 17.
- Monasticism and penitential works, 117.
- Monument, an Anglican, 149.
- NESTORIANS, Anglicanism and the, the Mass, Invocation of Saints, Prayers for the Dead, 182, 443.
- Norman Settlement, ten facts of the, 77.
- OATHS of Catholic and Anglican bishops contrasted, 97.
- Obedience, Anglican, 1.
- Opportunism and Anglicanism, 315.
- Order and jurisdiction, 363.
- Order, power of, immediately from Christ, 364.
- Ordinary jurisdiction, 368.
- Osmund, Anglican Guild of St., 422.
- Oxford and Pope Martin V., 334, 340.
- PALLIUM, the, 63.
- Papal exemptions, use of, 413.
- Participation in non-Catholic worship, 206.
- Passion services in Anglican Churches, 143.
- Patriarchate? why not an Anglican, 13.
- Patrick, St., his Confessions on monastic life, 159.
- Paulinus, St., 90.
- Peckham, Archbishop, 242.
- Perpetuity of institutions secured by Papal Bulls, 413.
- Peter's Chair, St., prayer in St. Ethelwold's Benedictional, 381.
- Peter's Pence, 68.
- Peterborough, dedication service at, 301.
- Petrine prerogative, 371.
- Plunket, Archbishop, and his ordination of Cabrera, 271.
- Pope, English custom of praying for the, 67; his licence required for the resignation and translation of English bishops, 114.
- "Pope and King," ancient precedence in English custom, 408 *n.*
- Prayer-book, the Spanish Reformed Church, 278.
- Presidence of Councils, differences between Papal and Imperial, 105.
- Priors, the Winchester, 390.
- Private judgment, its use and abuse, 356.

Privileges of Winchester priors obtained from Pope, 391.
 Prosper of Aquitaine on St. German, 472.
 Provision, Bulls of, the renunciation clause in writs, 111.
 Provisors, Rome and the Statutes of, 326.
 Purgatory, Anglicanism and the doctrine of, 260; Catholic doctrine of, 268.

QUARREL between Rome and England, 333.

Quivil, Bishop of Exeter, on Roman authorisation of relics, 233; and the Apostolic See, 299.

"RECENT DOCTRINES" and Bishop Gore, 432.

Reconciliation of St. Paul's Cathedral, 23.

Relics and relic worship, 225.

Renunciation of clauses in Bulls of Provision, 111.

Requiem services in Anglican Churches, 260.

Revelation and free thought, 355.

Richard, St., of Andria, of Chichester, 151.

Ritual, the expression of belief, 55.

Rome and the Statute of Provisors, 326.

Royal Supremacy and the constitution of the Catholic Church, 98; unscriptural, unhistorical, 103.

Ryle (Bishop) on vows, 19.

SACRAMENTUM UNITATIS, 490.

Salisbury, Bishop of, on Church unity, 458; on Protestantism in Italy, 30.

School Chapel at Winchester, 399.

School, Winchester, 412.

Scripture, Anglicanism and the appeal to, 343; Catholic appeal to, 348.

Scripture, appeal to, and Church Congress, 429.

Self-constituted church, 476.

Seven words on Cross, 146.

"Special Member" of the Holy Church of Rome, the English Church, 32.

Statutes of William of Wykeham, 405-12.

Stephen, King, his quarrel with the Chapter of York, 116.

Stigand, deposition of, by Roman authority, 385-86.

Stokes, Mr. Whitley, confession in Ancient Irish Church, 160.

Symmachus, Pope, on the position of the Emperor, 105.

TEMPLE, Archbishop, on eucharistic belief, 482.

Temporalities, royal writ restoring, 113.

Theodore, Archbishop, 64.

Theory, Anglican, St. Peter and the Apostles and the Bishops, 361.

Thomas Aquinas, St., on the Papacy, 154.

Thomas of York, 91.

Thorold, Bishop, his election, 108.

"Three Hours' Agony," Roman and Jesuit origin, 144.

Threefold line of Anglican defence, 236.

Thurstan, 91.

Trend of religious change, 147.

Trèves, holy coat of, 225.

- UNCREATED light, question of, 200.
- Unity, Anglican conception of Church, 458; three methods of explaining away disunity, 462.
- "Universal Bishop," St. Gregory's repudiation of the title, 83.
- VATICAN Council, was it forced? 8.
- Vaux, Laurence, on prohibition to take part in Anglican worship, 220.
- Virgin, the Blessed Virgin, Eastern devotion to, 193.
- Votive candle-burning, 422.
- Vows, 19.
- WALES, the Church in, 241, 256.
- Walkelyn consecrated by Papal Legate, 387.
- Waynflete, Bishop, his provision by the Pope, 110.
- Westminster Abbey and Edward the Confessor, 74.
- Wilfrid and his appeals, 64.
- William, Archbishop of York, 92.
- Winchester as an object-lesson of continuity, 373; its Catholic history, 376.
- Winchester, its priors, 390; Cathedral dedication, 387; its School Chapel, 399, 404 *et seq.*; School, 412.
- Wynfrid, St., or Boniface, 378.
- Worship in Winchester School Chapel, 404.
- Wykeham, William of, 393; his consecration, 326.
- YORK, the Diocese of, an object-lesson of continuity, 88.

BOOKS RECENTLY PUBLISHED.

Addresses to Cardinal Newman, with his Replies, 1879-81.
Edited by the Rev. W. P. NEVILLE (Cong. Orat.). With Portrait Group. Oblong Crown 8vo. 6s. net.

The addresses given in this book were those presented to Cardinal Newman on the occasion of his acceptance of the Cardinalate conferred upon him by Pope Leo XIII. in 1878. The addresses are preceded and followed by an account, written by the late Fr. Neville, of some of the incidents attending the offer of the Cardinalate, and of Dr. Newman's subsequent journey and projected second journey to Rome, he being over seventy-eight years old at this time. Portions of the official correspondence with reference to the offer and Dr. Newman's acceptance of the same are also given.

Gregory the Great: his Place in History and Thought. By F. HOMES DUDDEN, B.D., Fellow of Lincoln College, Oxford. 2 vols. 8vo. 30s. net.

THE BEGINNINGS OF THE CHURCH.

A SERIES OF HISTORIES OF THE FIRST CENTURY.

By THE ABBÉ CONSTANT FOUARD,

late Honorary Cathedral Canon, Professor of the Faculty of Theology at Rouen.

The Christ, The Son of God. A Life of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. With an Introduction by CARDINAL MANNING. With 3 Maps. 2 vols. Crown 8vo. 14s.

Saint Peter and the First Years of Christianity. With 3 Maps. Crown 8vo. 9s.

St. Paul and His Missions. With 2 Maps. Crown 8vo. 9s.

The Last Years of St. Paul. With 5 Maps and Plans. Crown 8vo. 9s.

St. John and the End of the Apostolic Age. Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.

Aspects of Anglicanism; or, a Comment on Certain Incidents in the 'Nineties. By the Right Rev. Mgr. Canon MOYES, D.D.

Mariale Novum: a Series of Sonnets on the Titles of Our Lady's Litany. By MEMBERS OF THE SOCIETY OF JESUS. Printed on hand-made paper, and bound in art green canvas with cover design in blue and gilt, gilt top. Pott 4to. 3s. 6d. net.

The Catholic Church from Within. With a Preface by His Eminence CARDINAL VAUGHAN, late Archbishop of Westminster. Crown 8vo. 6s. 6d. net.

The Inner Life of the Soul. Short Spiritual Messages for the Ecclesiastical Year. By S. L. EMERY. Crown 8vo. 4s. 6d. net.

LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO.,
LONDON, NEW YORK, AND BOMBAY.

BOOKS RECENTLY PUBLISHED.

The Old Riddle and the Newest Answer. By JOHN GERARD, S.J., F.L.S. Crown 8vo. 5s. net.

. *This is an inquiry as to how far modern science has altered the aspect of the problem of the Universe.*

Letters from the Beloved City. To S. B., from Philip. Crown 8vo. 1s. 6d.

CONTENTS:—Why Philip writes these letters to S. B.—S. B.'s difficulties fully stated—The Good Shepherd—I come that they may have life—Feed my Lambs—Feed my Sheep—One Fold and One Shepherd—Christ's Mother and Christ's Church—Unity—Holiness—Catholicity—Apostolicity—Our Lady's Dowry—War—Pacification.

The Soul's Orbit; or, Man's Journey to God. Compiled, with Additions, by M. D. PETRE. Crown 8vo. 4s. 6d. net.

Roads to Rome: being Personal Records of some of the more recent Converts to the Catholic Faith. With an Introduction by His Eminence CARDINAL VAUGHAN, late Archbishop of Westminster. Compiled and Edited by the Author of "Ten Years in Anglican Orders". Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d. net.

Studies on the Gospels. By VINCENT ROSE, O.P., Professor in the University of Fribourg. Authorised English Version, by ROBERT FRASER, D.D., Domestic Prelate to H.H. Pius X. Crown 8vo. 6s. net.

Lent and Holy Week: Chapters on Catholic Observance and Ritual. By HERBERT THURSTON, S.J. With 3 Plates and 14 Illustrations in the text. Crown 8vo. 6s. net.

WORKS BY GEORGE TYRRELL, S.J.

The Faith of the Millions: Essays. First and Second Series. Crown 8vo. 5s. net each.

Nova et Vetera: Informal Meditations. Crown 8vo. 5s. net.

Hard Sayings: a Selection of Meditations and Studies. Crown 8vo. 5s. net.

Lex Orandi; or, Prayer and Creed. Crown 8vo. 5s. net.

WORKS BY WILFRID WARD.

Aubrey De Vere: a Memoir based on his unpublished Diaries and Correspondence. By WILFRID WARD. With 2 Portraits and 2 other Illustrations. 8vo. 14s. net.

The Life and Times of Cardinal Wiseman. By WILFRID WARD. With 3 Portraits. 2 vols. Crown 8vo. 10s. net.

A History of England for Catholic Schools. By E. WYATT-DAVIES, M.A. With 14 Maps. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.

LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO.,
LONDON, NEW YORK, AND BOMBAY.

The Westminster Library.

A SERIES OF MANUALS FOR CATHOLIC PRIESTS AND STUDENTS.

EDITED BY THE RIGHT REV. MGR. BERNARD WARD,
President of St. Edmund's College, Ware,
and THE REV. HERBERT THURSTON, S.J.

This series of Handbooks is designed to meet a need, which, the Editors believe, has been widely felt, and which results in great measure from the predominant importance attached to Dogmatic and Moral Theology in the studies preliminary to the Priesthood. That the first place must of necessity be given to these subjects will not be disputed. But there remains a large outlying field of professional knowledge which is always in danger of being crowded out in the years before ordination, and the practical utility of which may not be fully realised until some experience of the ministry has been gained. It will be the aim of the present series to offer the sort of help which is dictated by such experience, and its developments will be largely guided by the suggestions, past and future, of the clergy themselves. To provide Textbooks for Dogmatic Treatises is not contemplated—at any rate not at the outset. On the other hand, the pastoral work of the missionary priest will be kept constantly in view, and the series will also deal with those historical and liturgical aspects of Catholic belief and practice which are every day being brought more into prominence.

That the needs of English-speaking countries are, in these respects, exceptional, must be manifest to all. In point of treatment it seems desirable that the volumes should be popular rather than scholastic, but the Editors hope that by the selection of writers, fully competent in their special subjects, the information given may always be accurate and abreast of modern research.

THE TRADITION OF SCRIPTURE:

ITS ORIGIN, AUTHORITY, AND INTERPRETATION.

By THE REV. WILLIAM BARRY, D.D.,
Sometime Scholar of the English College, Rome, formerly Professor of
Theology in St. Mary's College, Oscott.

Crown 8vo, 3s. 6d. net.

[Ready.]

The following Volumes are in preparation:—

THE HOLY EUCHARIST.

By the Right Rev. JOHN CUTHBERT HEDLEY, O.S.B., Bishop of Newport.

THE CATHOLIC CALENDAR.

By the Rev. HERBERT THURSTON, S.J.

THE PRIEST'S STUDIES.

By the Rev. T. B. SCANNELL, D.D.

THE MASS.

By the Rev. HERBERT LUCAS, S.J.

OUR YOUNG PEOPLE: A Book for Priests and Parents.

By the Very Rev. JAMES CANON KEATINGE.

THE PRIEST AND HIS CHOIR.

By the Right Rev. Monsignor JAMES CANON CONNELLY.

THE STUDY OF THE FATHERS.

By the Rev. JOHN CHAPMAN, O.S.B.

THE PHILOSOPHY OF CHURCH HISTORY.

By WILFRID WARD.

LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO.,

39 PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON,

NEW YORK AND BOMBAY

A SELECT LIST
OF
THEOLOGICAL BOOKS

(MAINLY ROMAN CATHOLIC)

PUBLISHED BY

LONGMANS, GREEN, & CO.

LONDON, NEW YORK, AND BOMBAY.

CARDINAL NEWMAN'S WORKS.

Apologia pro Vita Sua. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.

POPULAR EDITION. 8vo. 6d. net.

*** *The Popular Edition contains a letter, hitherto unpublished, by Cardinal Newman to Canon Flanagan in 1857, which may be said to contain in embryo the "Apologia" itself.*

Letters and Correspondence of John Henry Newman during his Life in the English Church. With a brief Autobiography. Edited, at Cardinal Newman's request, by ANNE MOZLEY. 2 vols. Cr. 8vo. 7s.

Selection, Adapted to the Seasons of the Ecclesiastical Year, from the 'Parochial and Plain Sermons'. Edited by the Rev. W. J. COPELAND, B.D. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.

CONTENTS:—*Advent*: Self-Denial the Test of Religious Earnestness—Divine Calls—The Ventures of Faith—Watching. *Christmas Day*: Religious Joy. *New Year's Sunday*: The Lapse of Time. *Epiphany*: Remembrance of Past Mercies—Equanimity—The Immortality of the Soul—Christian Manhood—Sincerity and Hypocrisy—Christian Sympathy. *Septuagesima*: Present Blessings. *Sexagesima*: Endurance, the Christian's Portion. *Quinquagesima*: Love, the One Thing Needful. *Lent*: The Individuality of the Soul—Life, the Season of Repentance—Bodily Suffering—Tears of Christ at the Grave of Lazarus—Christ's Privations, a Meditation for Christians—The Cross of Christ the Measure of the World. *Good Friday*: The Crucifixion. *Easter Day*: Keeping Fast and Festival. *Easter Tide*: Witnesses of the Resurrection—A Particular Providence as revealed in the Gospel—Christ Manifested in Remembrance—The Invisible World—Waiting for Christ. *Ascension*: Warfare the Condition of Victory. *Sunday after Ascension*: Rising with Christ. *Whitsun Day*: The Weapons of Saints. *Trinity Sunday*: The Mysteriousness of our Present Being. *Sundays after Trinity*: Holiness Necessary for Future Blessedness—The Religious Use of Excited Feelings—The Self-Wise Inquirer—Scripture a Record of Human Sorrow—The Danger of Riches—Obedience without Love, as instanced in the Character of Balaam—Moral Consequences of Single Sins—The Greatness and Littleness of Human Life—Moral Effects of Communion with God—The Thought of God the Stay of the Soul—The Power of the Will—The Gospel Palaces—Religion a Weariness to the Natural Man—The World our Enemy—The Praise of Men—Religion Pleasant to the Religious—Mental Prayer—Curiosity a Temptation to Sin—Miracles no Remedy for Unbelief—Jeremiah, a Lesson for the Disappointed—The Shepherd of our Souls—Doing Glory to God in Pursuits of the World.

CARDINAL NEWMAN'S WORKS.

Parochial and Plain Sermons. Edited by Rev. W. J. COPELAND, B.D.,
late Rector of Farnham, Essex. 8 vols. Sold separately. Crown
8vo. 3s. 6d. each.

CONTENTS OF VOL. I.:—Holiness necessary for Future Blessedness—The Immortality of the Soul—Knowledge of God's Will without Obedience—Secret Faults—Self-Denial the Test of Religious Earnestness—The Spiritual Mind—Sins of Ignorance and Weakness—God's Commandments not Grievous—The Religious Use of Excited Feelings—Profession without Practice—Profession without Hypocrisy—Profession without Ostentation—Promising without Doing—Religious Emotion—Religious Faith Rational—The Christian Mysteries—The Self-Wise Inquirer—Obedience the Remedy for Religious Perplexity—Times of Private Prayer—Forms of Private Prayer—The Resurrection of the Body—Witnesses of the Resurrection—Christian Reverence—The Religion of the Day—Scripture a Record of Human Sorrow—Christian Manhood.

CONTENTS OF VOL. II.:—The World's Benefactors—Faith without Sight—The Incarnation—Martyrdom—Love of Relations and Friends—The Mind of Little Children—Ceremonies of the Church—The Glory of the Christian Church—St. Paul's Conversion viewed in Reference to his Office—Secrecy and Suddenness of Divine Visitations—Divine Decrees—The Reverence Due to the Blessed Virgin Mary—Christ, a Quickening Spirit—Saving Knowledge—Self-Contemplation—Religious Cowardice—The Gospel Witnesses—Mysteries in Religion—The Indwelling Spirit—The Kingdom of the Saints—The Gospel, a Trust Committed to us—Tolerance of Religious Error—Rebuking Sin—The Christian Ministry—Human Responsibility—Guilelessness—The Danger of Riches—The Powers of Nature—The Danger of Accomplishments—Christian Zeal—Use of Saints' Days.

CONTENTS OF VOL. III.:—Abraham and Lot—Wilfulness of Israel in Rejecting Samuel—Saul—Early Years of David—Jerohoam—Faith and Obedience—Christian Repentance—Contracted Views in Religion—A Particular Providence as revealed in the Gospel—Tears of Christ at the Grave of Lazarus—Bodily Suffering—The Humiliation of the Eternal Son—Jewish Zeal a Pattern to Christians—Submission to Church Authority—Contest between Truth and Falsehood in the Church—The Church Visible and Invisible—The Visible Church an Encouragement to Faith—The Gift of the Spirit—Regenerating Baptism—Infant Baptism—The Daily Service—The Good Part of Mary—Religious Worship a Remedy for Excitements—Intercession—The Intermediate State.

CONTENTS OF VOL. IV.:—The Strictness of the Law of Christ—Obedience without Love, as instanced in the Character of Balaam—Moral Consequences of Single Sins—Acceptance of Religious Privileges Compulsory—Reliance on Religious Observances—The Individuality of the Soul—Chastisement amid Mercy—Peace and Joy amid Chastisement—The State of Grace—The Visible Church for the Sake of the Elect—The Communion of Saints—The Church a Home for the Lonely—The Invisible World—The Greatness and Littleness of Human Life—Moral Effects of Communion with God—Christ Hidden from the World—Christ Manifested in Remembrance—The Gainsaying of Korah—The Mysteriousness of our Present Being—The Ventures of Faith—Faith and Love—Watching—Keeping Fast and Festival.

CONTENTS OF VOL. V.:—Worship, a Preparation for Christ's Coming—Reverence, a Belief in God's Presence—Unreal Words—Shrinking from Christ's Coming—Equanimity—Remembrance of Past Mercies—The Mystery of Godliness—The State of Innocence—Christian Sympathy—Righteousness not of us, but in us—The Law of the Spirit—The New Works of the Gospel—The State of Salvation—Transgressions and Infirmities—Sins of Infirmity—Sincerity and Hypocrisy—The Testimony of Conscience—Many called, Few chosen—Present Blessings—Endurance, the Christian's Portion—Affliction, a School of Comfort—The Thought of God, the Stay of the Soul—Love, the One Thing Needful—The Power of the Will.

CONTENTS OF VOL. VI.:—Fasting, a Source of Trial—Life, the Season of Repentance—Apostolic Abstinence, a Pattern for Christians—Christ's Privations, a Meditation for Christians—Christ the Son of God made Man—The Incarnate Son, a Sufferer and Sacrifice—The Cross of Christ the Measure of the World—Difficulty of realising Sacred Privileges—The Gospel Sign Addressed to Faith—The Spiritual Presence of Christ in the Church—The Eucharistic Presence—Faith the Title for Justification—Judaism of the Present Day—The Fellowship of the Apostles—Rising with Christ—Warfare the Condition of Victory—Waiting for Christ—Subjection of the Reason and Feelings to the Revealed Word—The Gospel Palaces—The Visible Temple—Offerings for the Sanctuary—The Weapons of Saints—Faith Without Demonstration—The Mystery of the Holy Trinity—Peace in Believing.

CARDINAL NEWMAN'S WORKS.

Parochial and Plain Sermons.—*Continued.*

CONTENTS OF VOL. VII.:—The Lapse of Time—Religion, a Weariness to the Natural Man—The World our Enemy—The Praise of Men—Temporal Advantages—The Season of Epiphany—The Duty of Self-Denial—The Yoke of Christ—Moses the Type of Christ—The Crucifixion—Attendance on Holy Communion—The Gospel Feast—Love of Religion, a new Nature—Religion Pleasant to the Religious—Mental Prayer—Infant Baptism—The Unity of the Church—Steadfastness in the Old Paths.

CONTENTS OF VOL. VIII.:—Reverence in Worship—Divine Calls—The Trial of Saul—The Call of David—Curiosity, a Temptation to Sin—Miracles no Remedy for Unbelief—Josiab, a Pattern for the Ignorant—Inward Witness to the Truth of the Gospel—Jeremiah, a Lesson for the Disappointed—Endurance of the World's Censure—Doing Glory to God in Pursuits of the World—Vanity of Human Glory—Truth Hidden when not Sought after—Obedience to God the Way to Faith in Christ—Sudden Conversions—The Shepherd of our Souls—Religious Joy—Ignorance of Evil.

Sermons Preached on Various Occasions. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.

CONTENTS:—Intellect the Instrument of Religious Training—The Religion of the Pharisee and the Religion of Mankind—Waiting for Christ—The Secret Power of Divine Grace—Dispositions for Faith—Omnipotence in Bonds—St. Paul's Characteristic Gift—St. Paul's Gift of Sympathy—Christ upon the Waters—The Second Spring—Order, the Witness and Instrument of Unity—The Mission of St. Philip Neri—The Tree beside the Waters—In the World but not of the World—The Pope and the Revolution.

Sermons Bearing upon Subjects of the Day. Edited by the Rev.

W. J. COPELAND, B.D., late Rector of Farnham, Essex. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.

CONTENTS:—The Work of the Christian—Saintliness not Forfeited by the Penitent—Our Lord's Last Supper and His First—Dangers to the Penitent—The Three Offices of Christ—Faith and Experience—Faith unto the World—The Church and the World—Indulgence in Religious Privileges—Connection between Personal and Public Improvement—Christian Nobleness—Joshua a Type of Christ and His Followers—Elisha a Type of Christ and His Followers—The Christian Church a Continuation of the Jewish—The Principles of Continuity between the Jewish and Christian Churches—The Christian Church an Imperial Power—Sanctity the Token of the Christian Empire—Condition of the Members of the Christian Empire—The Apostolic Christian—Wisdom and Innocence—Invisible Presence of Christ—Outward and Inward Notes of the Church—Grounds for Steadfastness in our Religious Profession—Elijah the Prophet of the Latter Days—Feasting in Captivity—The Parting of Friends.

Fifteen Sermons Preached before the University of Oxford.

between A.D. 1826 and 1843. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.

CONTENTS:—The Philosophical Temper, first enjoined by the Gospel—The Influence of Natural and Revealed Religion respectively—Evangelical Sanctity the Perfection of Natural Virtue—The Usurpations of Reason—Personal Influence, the Means of Propagating the Truth—On Justice as a Principle of Divine Governance—Contest between Faith and Sight—Human Responsibility, as independent of Circumstances—Wilfulness, the Sin of Saul—Faith and Reason, contrasted as Habits of Mind—The Nature of Faith in Relation to Reason—Love, the Safeguard of Faith against Superstition—Implicit and Explicit Reason—Wisdom, as contrasted with Faith and with Bigotry—The Theory of Developments in Religious Doctrine.

CARDINAL NEWMAN'S WORKS.

Verses on Various Occasions. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.

Discourses Addressed to Mixed Congregations. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.

CONTENTS:—The Salvation of the Hearer the Motive of the Preacher—Neglect of Divine Calls and Warnings—Men not Angles—The Priests of the Gospel—Purity and Love—Saintliness the Standard of Christian Principle—God's Will the End of Life—Perseverance in Grace—Nature and Grace—Illuminating Grace—Faith and Private Judgment—Faith and Doubt—Prospects of the Catholic Missioner—Mysteries of Nature and of Grace—The Mystery of Divine Condescension—The Infinitude of Divine Attributes—Mental Sufferings of our Lord in His Passion—The Glories of Mary for the Sake of Her Son—On the Fitness of the Glories of Mary.

Lectures on the Doctrine of Justification. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.

CONTENTS:—Faith considered as the Instrumental Cause of Justification—Love considered as the Formal Cause of Justification—Primary Sense of the term 'Justification'—Secondary Senses of the term 'Justification'—Misuse of the term 'Just' or 'Righteous'—The Gift of Righteousness—The Characteristics of the Gift of Righteousness—Righteousness viewed as a Gift and as a Quality—Righteousness the Fruit of our Lord's Resurrection—The Office of Justifying Faith—The Nature of Justifying Faith—Faith viewed relatively to Rites and Works—On Preaching the Gospel—Appendix.

On the Development of Christian Doctrine. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.

The Idea of a University Defined and Illustrated. I. In Nine Discourses delivered to the Catholics of Dublin; II. In Occasional Lectures and Essays addressed to the members of the Catholic University. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.

An Essay in Aid of a Grammar of Assent. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.

Two Essays on Miracles. 1. Of Scripture. 2. Of Ecclesiastical History. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.

Discussions and Arguments. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.

1. How to accomplish it. 2. The Antichrist of the Fathers. 3. Scripture and the Creed. 4. Tamworth Reading-room. 5. Who's to Blame? 6. An Argument for Christianity.

Essays, Critical and Historical. 2 vols. Crown 8vo. 7s.

1. Poetry. 2. Rationalism. 3. Apostolic Tradition. 4. De la Menais. 5. Palmer on Faith and Unity. 6. St. Ignatius. 7. Prospects of the Anglican Church. 8. The Anglo-American Church. 9. Countess of Huntingdon. 10. Catholicity of the Anglican Church. 11. The Antichrist of Protestants. 12. Milman's Christianity. 13. Reformation of the XI. Century. 14. Private Judgment. 15. Davison. 16. Keble.

CARDINAL NEWMAN'S WORKS.

Historical Sketches. 3 vols. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d. each.

1. The Turks. 2. Cicero. 3. Apollonius. 4. Primitive Christianity.
5. Church of the Fathers. 6. St. Chrysostom. 7. Theodoret. 8. St.
Benedict. 9. Benedictine Schools. 10. Universities. 11. Northmen and
Normans. 12. Mediæval Oxford. 13. Convocation of Canterbury.

The Arians of the Fourth Century. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.

**Select Treatises of St. Athanasius in Controversy with the
Arians.** Freely translated. 2 vols. Crown 8vo. 7s.

Theological Tracts. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.

1. Dissertatiunculæ. 2. On the Text of the Seven Epistles of St.
Ignatius. 3. Doctrinal Causes of Arianism. 4. Apollinarianism. 5. St.
Cyril's Formula. 6. Ordo de Tempore. 7. Douay Version of Scriptures.

The Via Media of the Anglican Church. 2 Vols. Crown 8vo.
3s. 6d. each.

Vol. I. Prophetical Office of the Church.

Vol. II. Occasional Letters and Tracts.

**Certain Difficulties felt by Anglicans in Catholic Teaching Con-
sidered.** 2 vols.

Vol. I. Twelve Lectures. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.

Vol. II. Letters to Dr. Pusey concerning the Blessed Virgin, and to
the Duke of Norfolk in defence of the Pope and Council
Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.

Present Position of Catholics in England. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.

Loss and Gain. The Story of a Convert. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.

Callista. A Tale of the Third Century. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.

The Dream of Gerontius. 16mo, sewed, 6d.; cloth, 1s. *net*.

Meditations and Devotions. Part I. Meditations for the Month of
May. Novena of St. Philip. Part II. The Stations of the Cross.
Meditations and Intercessions for Good Friday. Litanies, etc.
Part III. Meditations on Christian Doctrine. Conclusion. Oblong
Crown 8vo. 5s. *net*.

- BOUGAUD.**—**History of St. Vincent de Paul**, Founder of the Congregation of the Mission (Vincentians), and of the Sisters of Charity. By Monseigneur BOUGAUD, Bishop of Laval. Translated from the Second French Edition by the Rev. JOSEPH BRADY, C.M. With an Introduction by His Eminence CARDINAL VAUGHAN, late Archbishop of Westminster. With 2 Portraits. 2 vols. 8vo. 16s. *net*.
- Catholic Church (The) from Within.** With a Preface by His Eminence CARDINAL VAUGHAN, late Archbishop of Westminster. Crown 8vo. 6s. 6d. *net*.
- CHAPMAN.**—**Bishop Gore and the Catholic Claims.** By Dom JOHN CHAPMAN, O.S.B. 8vo, sewed, 6d. *net*; cloth, 1s. *net*.
- DE MONTALEMBERT.**—**Life of St. Elizabeth of Hungary, Duchess of Thuringia.** By the COUNT DE MONTALEMBERT, Peer of France, Member of the French Academy, Author of "The Monks of the West". Translated by FRANCIS DEMING HOYT. Crown 8vo. 10s. 6d. *net*.
- DOBREE.**—**Stories on the Rosary.** By LOUISA EMILY DOBRÉE. 3 Parts. Crown 8vo. Each 1s. 6d.
- DRANE.**—**A Memoir of Mother Francis Raphael O.S.D. (Augusta Theodosia Drane)**, some time Prioress Provincial of the Congregation of Dominican Sisters of S. Catherine of Siena, Stone. With some of her Spiritual Notes and Letters. Edited by Rev. Father BERTRAND WILBERFORCE, O.P. With Portrait. Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.
- The History of St. Dominic Founder of the Friar Preachers.** By AUGUSTA THEODOSIA DRANE. With 32 Illustrations. 8vo. 15s.
- The History of St. Catherine of Siena and her Companions.** With a Translation of her Treatise on Consummate Perfection. By AUGUSTA THEODOSIA DRANE. With 10 Illustrations. 2 vols. 8vo. 15s.
- EMERY.**—**The Inner Life of the Soul.** Short Spiritual Messages for the Ecclesiastical Year. By S. L. EMERY. Crown 8vo. 4s. 6d. *net*.
- FLETCHER.**—**The School of the Heart.** By MARGARET FLETCHER, Author of "Light for New Times". Fcp. 8vo. 2s. 6d. *net*.
CONTENTS:—Falling in Love—Married Life—The Woman of Leisure.
- FOUARD.**—**THE BEGINNINGS OF THE CHURCH.** A Series of Histories of the First Century. By the ABBÉ CONSTANT FOUARD, Honorary Cathedral Canon, Professor of the Faculty of Theology at Rouen, etc., etc. Translated by GEORGE F. X. GRIFFITH.
- The Christ, The Son of God.** A Life of Our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. With an Introduction by CARDINAL MANNING. With 3 Maps. 2 vols. Crown 8vo. 14s.
- Saint Peter and the First Years of Christianity.** With 3 Maps. Crown 8vo. 9s.
- St. Paul and His Missions.** With 2 Maps. Crown 8vo. 9s.
- The Last Years of St. Paul.** With 5 Maps and Plans. Cr. 8vo. 9s.
- St. John and the End of the Apostolic Age.** Crown 8vo.
[In preparation.]

GERARD.—The Old Riddle and the Newest Answer. By JOHN GERARD, S.J., F.L.S. Crown 8vo. 5s. *net*.

*** This is an inquiry as to how far modern science has altered the aspect of the problem of the Universe.*

Letters from the Beloved City. To S. B., from Philip. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d. *net*.

CONTENTS:—Why Philip writes these letters to S. B.—S. B.'s difficulties fully stated—The Good Shepherd—I come that they may have life—Feed my Lambs—Feed my Sheep—One Fold and One Shepherd—Christ's Mother and Christ's Church—Unity—Holiness—Catholicity—Apostolicity—Our Lady's Dowry—War—Pacification.

McNABB.—Infallibility. A Paper Read before the Society of St. Thomas of Canterbury. By the Rev. VINCENT McNABB, O.P., at the Holborn Town Hall, on Thursday, 16th May, 1905. With an Introduction by the Rev. SPENCER JONES, M.A., President of the Society of St. Thomas of Canterbury. Crown 8vo. Sewed, 1s. *net*.

Month (The). A Catholic Magazine. Conducted by the Fathers of the Society of Jesus. Price One Shilling Monthly.

PETRE.—The Soul's Orbit; or, Man's Journey to God. Compiled, with Additions, by M. D. PETRE. Crown 8vo. 4s. 6d. *net*.

Roads to Rome: being Personal Records of some of the more recent Converts to the Catholic Faith. With an Introduction by His Eminence CARDINAL VAUGHAN, late Archbishop of Westminster. Compiled and Edited by the Author of "Ten Years in Anglican Orders". Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d. *net*.

*** Among the Contributors are Lord Brampton (Sir Henry Hawkins); Sir Henry Bellingham, Bart.; Dr. Edward Bevdoe; Monsignor Croke Robinson; The Bishop of Clifton; The Rev. Bede Camm, O.S.B.; Miss Adeline Sergeant; The Bishop of Emmaus; C. Kegan Paul, Esq.; The Rev. W. O. Sutcliffe; and the Bishop of Hexham and Newcastle.*

ROSE.—Studies on the Gospels. By VINCENT ROSE, O.P., Professor in the University of Fribourg. Authorised English Version, by ROBERT FRASER, D.D., Domestic Prelate to H.H. Pius X. Crown 8vo. 6s. *net*.

SHAHAN.—Saint Patrick in History. By the Very Rev. THOMAS J. SHAHAN, D.D. Fcp. 8vo. 2s. *net*.

SHEEHAN.—Works by the Very Rev. Canon P. A. SHEEHAN, D.D.

Luke Delmege. A Novel. Crown 8vo. 6s.

Glenanaar: a Story of Irish Life. Crown 8vo. 6s.

"Lost Angel of a Ruined Paradise": a Drama of Modern Life. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.

THURSTON.—Lent and Holy Week: Chapters on Catholic Observance and Ritual. By HERBERT THURSTON, S.J. With 3 Plates and 14 Illustrations in the text. Crown 8vo. 6s. *net*.

TYRRELL.—Works by GEORGE TYRRELL, S.J.:

The Faith of the Millions: Essays. First and Second Series. Crown 8vo. 5s. *net* each.

FIRST SERIES: Introduction—1. A more Excellent Way—2. Wiseman: his Aims and Methods—3. The Prospects of Reunion—4. "Liberal" Catholicism—5. "Rationalism in Religion"—6. Sabatier on the Vitality of Dogmas—7. Authority and Evolution, the Life of Catholic Dogma—8. "The Mind of the Church"—9. The Use of Scholasticism—10. The Relation of Theology to Devotion—11. What is Mysticism?—12. The True and the False Mysticism.

SECOND SERIES: 13. Juliana of Norwich—14. Poet and Mystic—15. Two Estimates of Catholic Life—16. A Life of De Lamennais—17. Lippo, the Man and the Artist—18. Through Art to Faith—19. Tracts for the Million—20. An Apostle of Naturalism—21. "The Making of Religion"—22. Adaptability as a Proof of Religion—23. Idealism in Straits.

TYRRELL.—Works by GEORGE TYRRELL, S.J. (*continued*).

Nova et Vetera : Informal Meditations. Crown 8vo. 5s. *net*.

Hard Sayings : a Selection of Meditations and Studies. Cr. 8vo. 5s. *net*.

Lex Orandi ; or, Prayer and Creed. Crown 8vo. 5s. *net*.

WARD.—**One Poor Scruple** : a Novel. By MRS. WILFRID WARD.
Crown 8vo. 6s.

WARD.—Works by WILFRID WARD.

Problems and Persons. 8vo. 14s. *net*.

CONTENTS:—The Time-Spirit of the Nineteenth Century—The Rigidity of Rome—Unchanging Dogma and Changeful Man—Balfour's 'The Foundations of Belief'—Candour in Biography—Tennyson—Thomas Henry Huxley—Two Mottoes of Cardinal Newman—Newman and Renan—Some Aspects of the Life-work of Cardinal Wiseman—The Life of Mrs. Augustus Craven.

Aubrey De Vere : a Memoir based on his unpublished Diaries and Correspondence. With 2 Portraits and 2 other Illustrations. 8vo. 14s. *net*.

*** Among other items of interest the volume contains contemporary records of Mr. De Vere's intercourse with Wordsworth, Tennyson, Carlyle, Browning and Cardinal Newman; considerable selections from his correspondence with Sarah Coleridge, Sir Henry Taylor and Mrs. Edward Villiers (mother of the Dowager Lady Lytton), and contemporary descriptions of incidents of the Irish Famine of 1846-7. Some hitherto unpublished letters from Cardinal Newman are also included in the volume.*

The Life and Times of Cardinal Wiseman. With 3 Portraits.
2 vols. Crown 8vo. 10s. *net*.

WYATT-DAVIES.—**A History of England for Catholic Schools.**
By E. WYATT-DAVIES, M.A. With 14 Maps. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.

STONYHURST PHILOSOPHICAL SERIES.

EDITED BY RICHARD F. CLARKE, S.J.

Psychology: Empirical and Rational. By MICHAEL MAHER, S.J.,
D.Lit., M.A. Lond. Crown 8vo. 6s. 6d.

Logic. By RICHARD F. CLARKE, S.J. Crown 8vo. 5s.

The First Principles of Knowledge. By JOHN RICKABY, S.J.
Crown 8vo. 5s.

Moral Philosophy or Ethics and Natural Law. By JOSEPH
RICKABY, S.J. Crown 8vo. 5s.

General Metaphysics. By JOHN RICKABY, S.J. Crown 8vo. 5s.

Natural Theology. By BERNARD BOEDDER, S.J. Crown 8vo. 6s. 6d.

Political Economy. By CHARLES S. DEVAS, M.A. Oxon. Crown
8vo. 7s. 6d.

ENGLISH MANUALS OF CATHOLIC THEOLOGY.

Outlines of Dogmatic Theology. By SYLVESTER JOSEPH HUNTER,
of the Society of Jesus. Crown 8vo. 3 vols., 6s. 6d. each.

LONDON, NEW YORK, AND BOMBAY:
LONGMANS, GREEN, & CO.

34269

34269

UC SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY



A 000 671 128 7

